Al-Mīzān

An Exegesis of the Qur'an

al-ʿAllāmah al-Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī

Translated by: ʿAllāmah Sayyid Saʿīd Akhtār Rizvī

Volume 3
(Second Edition, 2020)

Tawheed Institute Australia Ltd.
Sydney, Australia
www.tawheed.com.au

All rights reserved © 2013-2020
English translation
Second edition 1442/2020

Translated from the original Arabic titled: *al-Mīzān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān* as published by Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī al-Ṭābʿia li Jamāʿat al-Mudarrisīn fī al-Ḥawza al-ʿIlmiyya fī Qumm al-Muqaddasa, 1417 AH (vol. number).

Published by: Tawheed Institute Australia Ltd.
Sydney, Australia
www.tawheed.com.au

almizan.org

In the Name of Allah,
the Beneficent, the Merciful.

All praise is due to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds;
the Beneficent, the Merciful;
the Master of the Day of Judgment;
Thee only we serve, and to Thee alone we beseech
for help;
Guide us in the straight path;
The path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed
favors,not of those against whom Thou art
wrathful, nor of those who are astray.

almizan.org

O' Allah! send your blessings to the head of
your Messengers and the last of
your Prophets,
Muhammad and his pure and cleansed progeny.
Also send your blessings to all your
Prophets and envoys.

almizan.org

Contents

Arabic Transliteration Key vii
Publisher's Note viii
Foreword & Introduction ix
About the Translator x
About the Author xi

Chapter 2: *Al-Baqarah* (The Cow)

Verses 183-185 1
Introduction 2
Commentary 4
Examining Narrations 27
Verse 186 34
Commentary 34
Examining Narrations 40
Verse 187 52
Commentary 52
Examining Narrations 58
Verse 188 62
Commentary 62
Examining Narrations 63
On Social Science 64
Verse 189 66
Commentary 66
Examining Narrations 69
Verses 190-195 72
Introduction 73
Commentary 74
The War as Ordained by the Qur'an 80
From the Sociological Point of View 85
Examining Narrations 87
Verses 196-203 92
Introduction 94

almizan.org

Commentary 94
Examining Narrations 105
Narrations on *Mutʿatu al-Ḥajj* 111
Verses 204-207 123
Introduction 123
Commentary 123
Examining Narrations 128
Verses 208-210 131
Introduction 131
Commentary 131
Examining Narrations 136
Other Narrations (Day of Return) 138
Verses 211-212 143
Commentary 143
Verse 213 146
Introduction 146
How Mankind came into Being 147
His Composition from Soul and Body 148
His Perception and Connection with Other Things 149
His Practical Knowledge 149
His Exploitation of Other Things 151
Man is Social by Nature 151
Difference Among Human Beings 152
Religion Removes the Difference 155
Difference in Religion Itself 157
Man After this World 158
Commentary 158
Sinlessness of the Prophets 170
About Prophethood 177
Examining Narrations 181
Prophethood From a Philosophical Point of View 188
Sociological Arguments About Prophethood 190
Verse 214 199
Commentary 199
Verse 215 202
Commentary 202
Examining Narrations 205

almizan.org

Verses 216-218 207
Commentary 208
Forfeiture of Deeds 213
An Essay on the Rules Governing Actions 218
A) About Their Reward and Punishment: 218
B) Actions Preserved, Written and Embodied: 228
C) Relation Between Actions and "Natural" Phenomena: 229
D)Actions with Reference to Happiness and Misery: 234
E) Actions with Reference to Reason: 237
Examining Narrations 238
Verses 219-220 243
Commentary 243
Examining Narrations 252
Verse 221 257
Commentary 257
Examining Narrations 262
Verses 222-223 264
Commentary 264
Examining Narrations 273

almizan.org

almizan.org

Arabic Transliteration Key

Arabic Letters	Transliteration	Arabic Letters	Transliteration
ا	ā	ع	ʿ
ب	b	غ	gh
ت	t	ف	f
ث	th	ق	q
ج	j	ك	k
ح	ḥ	ل	l
خ	kh	م	m
د	d	ن	m
ذ	dh	ه	h
ر	r	و	w/ū
ز	z	ى	y/ī
س	s	ء	ʾ
ش	sh	ة	-
ص	ṣ	ـَ	a
ض	ḍ	ـِ	i
ط	ṭ	ـُ	u
ظ	ẓ		

almizan.org

Publisher's Note

almizan.org

In an effort to make the text more accessible to English-speaking readers, the editors have chosen to use English names for the prophets and figures (as listed below but not limited to) and to use Anglicized terms that now appear in English dictionaries.

Ādam	Adam	Moses	Moses
Dāwūd	David	Sulaymān	Solomon
Hārūn	Aaron	Shuʿayb	Jethro
Ibrāhīm	Abraham	Yaʿqūb	Jacob
ʿĪsā	Jesus	ʾAyyūb	Job
Isḥāq	Isaac	Yūshaʿ	Joshua
Ismāʿīl	Ishmael	Yūsuf	Joseph
Jibrāʾīl	Gabriel	Zakariyyā	Zachariah
Mary	Mary		

almizan.org

Arabic terms and names have been transliterated according to the *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (*IJMES*).

For ease of reading, glyphs and traditional honorifics such as "peace be upon him" or (s.a.w.) which are commonly used as a gesture of respect after the name of the Prophet Muhammad, the Imams, or other sacred figures have been omitted from this text. No disrespect is intended, and may God's peace and blessings be upon them all!

almizan.org

Foreword & Introduction

We are pleased to present to the readers, the second edition of the third English volume of *Tafsīr al-Mīzān*. The first edition was published by World Organization for Islamic Services (WOFIS) around 1984. We hope to subsequently follow this, God willing, with the new edition of the remaining ten English volumes. The first thirteen English volumes were translated by the late ʿAllāmah Sayyid Saʿīd Akhtār Rizvī, may God elevate the status of his soul.

This second edition incorporates the new format which has been implemented in all our publications. Great care has been taken to ensure that the original translation is not altered or changed except in places where there were typographical or grammatical errors in the first publication. We sincerely ask the Almighty to forgive our shortcomings in the process of accomplishing the task of the second edition.

This volume covers the exegesis of verses 183-223 of the second Chapter of the Qur'an, "The Cow" and corresponds to the first half of the second volume of the Arabic text.

Some of the significant discussions of this volume are concerning the following subjects: The revelation of the Qur'an in the month of Ramaḍān and on the Night of Power with special emphasis on its gradual revelation; meaning of supplication; hajj and the generality of its laws; the problem of *al-rajʿah* (the return) and refutation of the doubts expressed by some people against it. There is also a comprehensive discussion about the reality and origin of human existence, the history of mankind, emergence of differences among human beings, human life in the Hereafter and other such issues. The author has expressed his scholarly opinion regarding these issues and analyzed them with remarkable insight.

There is another significant discussion regarding the problem of prophethood, which has been discussed from various angles, such as Qur'anic, philosophical and social.

Tawheed Institute Australia Ltd
December 2020

About the Translator

The late ʿAllāmah Sayyid Saʿīd Akhtār Rizvī was one of the most sincere preachers of Islam and an active scholar, both when he was in Tanzania in the Bilāl Muslim Mission (an Islamic organization active in Tanzania), and also when he returned to his own country of India. In the way of spreading Islam he has rendered enormous services and has been most active.

ʿAllāmah Sayyid Saʿīd Akhtār Rizvī had written scores of books and booklets in English, Urdu and Swahili, many of which have been published; and some other titles which have been published by WOFIS. Some of his books have been translated and published by in French, Italian, Japanese, Thai, Indonesian, Hausa and other languages.

almizan.org

almizan.org

About the Author

The late Islamic scholar, thinker, and philosopher, ʿAllāmah al-Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī came from the celebrated Ṭabāṭabāʾī family of Tabriz. For the last three centuries, this family has produced generation after generation of renowned religious scholars in Azerbaijan (Iran). They are descendants of the second Imam, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī (peace be on both of them). The clan is also referred to with the title, al-Qāḍī.

ʿAllāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī was the son of al-Sayyid Muḥammad b. al-Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī. ʿAllāmah was born in Tabriz on 29 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1321/17 March 1904. His father died in 1330 (1912). The orphaned child grew up in Tabriz, and after completing his religious education there, around 1341 (1923), he went to Najaf (Iraq), the most important center of Shia religious learning.

In Najaf, he began his higher studies with such illustrious scholars as Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥusayn Nāʾīnī al-Gharawī (1277–1355/1860 or 1861–1936), the son of Shaykh al-Islām ʿAbd al-Raḥīm, and Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Gharawī al-Iṣfahānī (1296–1361/1878–1942), the son of al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Ḥasan, Muʿīn al-Tujjār.

These two were among the most prominent scholars in the Shia world. They were among the most prominent scholars not only in the fields of Shia jurisprudence and principles of jurisprudence, but in all Islamic subjects. Their opinions and theories are still followed today. Each founded his own school of thought and trained thousands of Shia scholars and jurists; and all the *marājiʿ al-taqlīd*[1] of the Shia world, to this day, are their students. Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Gharawī al-Iṣfahānī was a philosopher, unsurpassed in his time; a man of literature; and a poet in Arabic and Persian; he was a genius whose achievements made others look up to him as their ideal. Shaykh Nāʾīnī, with his bold opinions and decrees in the political and social life of the Muslim *umma*, has carved for himself a niche in history.

ʿAllāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī was much influenced by these two teachers,

1 The highest authorities of Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*) whose rulings are followed by others.

particularly by al-Iṣfahānī, in the development of his thought and knowledge. A third influence was that of al-Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim Jaʿfar Khwānsārī (1313– 80/1895 or 1896–1961), the son of al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Mūsāwī, known as "the mathematician." ʿAllāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī was proud to have studied mathematics with him, and also wrote a book on higher mathematics, in which he applied some special theories of his teacher.

ʿAllāmah studied philosophy and metaphysics from al-Sayyid Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī Bādkūbahʾī; the latter was a student of al-Sayyid Riḍā, who studied with al-Sayyid Mūsā, a well-known teacher of philosophy and related subjects. In the fields of ethics and spirituality, ʿAllāmah received his training from his relatives, al-Sayyid ʿAlī al-Qāḍī (1285–1366/1869–1947), a well-known scholar who established a school of spiritual and ethical training which still flourishes today.

All these influences combined to create in ʿAllāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī a well-balanced academic and spiritual personality. He was a well-respected authority on religious subjects of jurisprudence and its fundamentals; a philosopher of independent views and new theories; and an inspired model of ethical and spiritual perfection. He not only taught morality, but also lived it. Yet it is also correct to state that his scholarship was overshadowed by his fame and prestige as a philosopher and a spiritual man.

ʿAllāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī returned to Tabriz in 1353/1934, where he was welcomed as a religious scholar. There he spent his time teaching higher philosophy to willing disciples—but it was a small place for his talents. In 1364/1945 he migrated to Qum, the most important center of religious education in Iran. In Qum, he remained engaged in imparting the knowledge of ethics, philosophy, and the exegesis of the Qur'an to those students who had already attained a high level of erudition. There he remained until his death on Sunday, 18 Muḥarram 1402/15 November 1981. May God bestow His mercy on him. Amen.

Many religious leaders of the present generation were and are among his students and disciples, the most famous being the late Murtaḍā Muṭahharī (1338–99/1920–79).

ʿAllāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī's fame rests on his academic works—the most important being his great exegesis of the Qur'an, *al-Mīzān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān.* It is said to be the foundation stone of the academic prestige which ʿAllāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī was accorded in the Muslim world.

Among his other works is *Uṣūl-i falsafah va ravish-i riʾalism* (Practical

and Philosophical Principles of Realism). This book is a comparative study of Islamic philosophy and various modern anti-Islamic schools of thoughts, especially Marxism. His disciple, the late Murtaḍā Muṭahharī, annotated this work, thus making it easily accessible to the average man.

A third book, *Shiʿa dār Islām*, was first published in Persian; later it was published in English with the title, *Shiʾite Islām*. The ʿAllāmah wrote this book on the request of Professor Kenneth Morgan of Colgate University, to introduce Shiism to the West.

However, it is his *tafsīr, al-Mīzān* (published in 20 volumes in Arabic) which presents the true picture of the author's academic style and his way of thinking. In the preface to volume 1, the author outlines his plan, to explain the Qur'an with the help of the Qur'an itself. This he faithfully does, all the way through to the end of the *tafsīr*.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Chapter 2

al-Baqarah (The Cow)

almizan.org

Verses 183-185

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الصِّيَامُ كَمَا كُتِبَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ
لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ ﴿١٨٣﴾ أَيَّامًا مَعْدُودَاتٍ ۚ فَمَنْ كَانَ مِنْكُمْ مَرِيضًا أَوْ عَلَىٰ سَفَرٍ فَعِدَّةٌ
مِنْ أَيَّامٍ أُخَرَ ۚ وَعَلَى الَّذِينَ يُطِيقُونَهُ فِدْيَةٌ طَعَامُ مِسْكِينٍ ۖ فَمَنْ تَطَوَّعَ خَيْرًا فَهُوَ
خَيْرٌ لَهُ ۚ وَأَنْ تَصُومُوا خَيْرٌ لَكُمْ ۖ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ ﴿١٨٤﴾ شَهْرُ رَمَضَانَ الَّذِي أُنْزِلَ
فِيهِ الْقُرْآنُ هُدًى لِلنَّاسِ وَبَيِّنَاتٍ مِنَ الْهُدَىٰ وَالْفُرْقَانِ ۚ فَمَنْ شَهِدَ مِنْكُمُ
الشَّهْرَ فَلْيَصُمْهُ ۖ وَمَنْ كَانَ مَرِيضًا أَوْ عَلَىٰ سَفَرٍ فَعِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَيَّامٍ أُخَرَ ۗ يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ
بِكُمُ الْيُسْرَ وَلَا يُرِيدُ بِكُمُ الْعُسْرَ وَلِتُكْمِلُوا الْعِدَّةَ وَلِتُكَبِّرُوا اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ مَا
هَدَاكُمْ وَلَعَلَّكُمْ تَشْكُرُونَ ﴿١٨٥﴾

(2:183) *O you who believe! Fasting has been prescribed for you, as it was prescribed for those before you, so that you may guard yourselves [against evil],*

(2:184) *for a counted number of days; but whoso among you be sick or on a journey than [he shall fast] that number of other days; and those who are with difficulty able to do so, on them is a redemption by feeding a poor man, and whoso on his own accord performs good, it is better for him, and that you fast is better for you if you know;*

(2:185) *The month of Ramadan, in which was sent down the Qur'an,*

a guidance for the people, and clear evidence of guidance and discrimination [between right and wrong]; so whosoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast therein; and whosoever is sick or on a journey [he shall fast] the same number of other days; Allah desires ease for you and He desires not hardship for you; and so that you may complete the [prescribed] number, and that you may glorify Allah for his guiding you, and so that you may be thankful to Him.

Introduction

The sequence of the three verses shows that they were revealed together; *for a counted number of days* (in the beginning of the second verse) is an adverbial phrase which qualifies the word, fasting, in the first verse; and the month of Ramaḍān in the beginning of the 3rd verse is a predicate, whose subject is a deleted but understood pronoun denoting the words c*ounted number of days* (which appear in the 2nd verse). Thus it would mean, the counted number of days is the month of Ramaḍān. Alternatively, it may be a subject of a deleted but implied predicate, and would mean the month of Ramaḍān is that in which fasting is prescribed for you. As a third possibility, it may be an alternative of the fasting mentioned in the first verse. Whatever be the grammatical position, it is the explanation and description of the counted number of days in which fasting has been prescribed. Therefore, all three verses are a well arranged statement with a single aim, that is, promulgation of the ordinance of fast in the month of Ramaḍān.

Obviously, the first sentences have been revealed to prepare minds for the final ones. The first two verses are like a preparatory statement, with which a speaker tries to keep the audience calm and quiet, and this ensures that they do not become restless on hearing the tough commandment which he is to announce shortly. All the sentences in these two verses gently lead the hearer's mind to the ordinance of the fast of Ramaḍān. They mention such things as remove gloom and anxiety, cheer the soul and imperceptibly assuage the mood of unruliness and disobedience. They point to various concessions and indulgences which have been incorporated in the commandment. And all this is in addition to the goods of this world and the next which may be earned by following the law. It is for this reason that the sentence o you who believe! Fasting has been

prescribed for you is followed by the phrase as it was prescribed for those before you—hinting that you should not think it as a heavy burden nor should you feel gloomy, for it is not a new command for which you have been singled out; it was ordained for previous peoples also.

It further encourages them by pointing out: by following this command you may get what you aim at by your faith—and that is piety (*taqwā*) which is the best thing for those who believe in God and the Day of Judgement—and you are believers. This is the import of the phrase so that you may guard yourselves (*tattaqūn*, from the same root as *taqwā*).

Moreover, this worthy action, which inspires the hope of piety in you (as it did in your predecessors) does not involve all your time, nor even most of it. It is only for a counted number of days. The word days (*ayyāman*,) is a common noun, and it shows insignificance. Its adjective, "counted," hints that the number is very easy (as we see in the words of God in the Qur'an, *And they sold him for a small price, some counted pieces of silver* (12:20)).

God, now points to further concessions: Look how We have been lenient on the man who has a genuine difficulty in keeping the fast, as well as on the person who is hard pressed to do so. Such a man should redeem it by a substitute which is neither difficult nor heavy, and that is feeding a poor person. But whoso among you be sick or on a journey, then (he shall fast) that number of other days; and those who are with difficulty able to do so, on them is a redemption by feeding a poor man. You must appreciate that this act brings much good to you; and that God has made it as easy for you as possible. It is in your interest that you should perform it willingly and eagerly without reluctance, sluggishness or annoyance; because if one performs a good deed on his own accord, it is better for him than if he does it under coercion. This point is made clear in the words: And whoso on his own accord performs good, it is better for him, and that you fast is better for you if you know.

In this way, the first two verses prepare minds for the third verse, *So whosoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast therein …*

In the light of this explanation, it is clear that the sentence in the first verse, *Fasting has been prescribed for you*, is the report of the fact of prescription; it is not the initial promulgation (like the verses, *O You who believe! retaliation is prescribed for you in the matter of the slain …*(2:178) and *bequest is prescribed for you, when death approaches one of you if he*

leaves behind wealth, for parents and near relatives … (2:180)) There is a difference between retaliation in the matter of the slain and bequeathing to parents and near relatives on the one hand, and the fast on the other. Retaliation for the slain is a matter which is dear to the hearts of the heirs of the slain; and it conforms with the natural rage which is inflamed in them when they see the murderer alive and safe without any worry for the crime he had committed. Likewise, tender love for one's relatives is in itself enough to encourage one to make one's will in favor of one's parents and relatives, and especially so at the time of death and permanent separation. These two commandments, that is, retaliation and bequest are in conformity with natural feelings, and, as such, they do not require preparatory statements or preambles before their promulgation. But the case of the fast is different. Here the man is denied his choicest desires and most coveted acquirements, that is, food, drink and sex. It is a heavy burden which should, by nature, be disliked by him. When such an order is directed to the general public it needs some preparatory and introductory statement so that they may accept this hardship willingly and eagerly. There fore, the prescription in the verses of retaliation for the slain and bequest for parents and relatives is the original promulgation (without need of any preamble); but the words: *Fasting has been prescribed for you* is just a report of the commandment and has been used as the preamble of the actual command which comes later: *so whosoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast therein …*

Commentary

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الصِّيَامُ كَمَا كُتِبَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ ﴿١٨٣﴾

(2:183) ***O' you who believe! Fasting has been prescribed for you, as it was prescribed for those before you, so that you may guard yourselves [against evil].***

This mode of address reminds them of a virtue (faith, belief) which encourages them to accept what ever order is given to them by their Lord, even if it is against their desires and habits.

The verse of retaliation also begins with this very phrase because the Christians, unlike other people, did not believe in retaliation. Therefore, it

was necessary to point out that retaliation is allowed to the faithful, even if others do not believe in it.

Fasting has been prescribed for you, as it was prescribed for those before you: *Kitābah* means to write. Metaphorically it is used for prescription, enjoinment and irrevocable decision, as God says, *Allah has written down: I will most certainly prevail, I and My messengers* (58:21); *and We write down what they have sent before and their footprints* (36:12); *and We wrote on them in it, a soul for a soul* (5:45).

Siyām and *ṣawm* are infinite verbs meaning to abstain from an action, like abstaining from eating, drinking, sexual intercourse, talking, walking, and so on. Also it is said that it means abstaining from desirable and coveted things. Later in religion, it was mostly used for abstaining from some specified things from dawn-break up to sunset with intention (*niyyah*).

Those before you means the nations that came before the advent of Islam: the followers of the previous prophets, like the followers of Moses and Jesus and so on. It is the meaning understood from this phrase wherever it occurs in the Qur'an.

The comparison as it was prescribed for those before you is not general; it does not cover all the peoples, nor all the details of the Islamic fast. In other words, it does not mean that the fast was prescribed for the followers of all previous prophets, nor that the fast ordained for them was like the Islamic fast in all the details, like period, rules and other particulars. The comparison is only in the principles of fasting and abstaining from some things without any regard to the particulars.

Those before you indicates followers of the previous religions without specifying who they were. The words as it was written (prescribed), show that they were followers of revealed religions; and that the fast was ordained for them. but the present Old and New Testaments do not say that fasting was compulsory and obligatory; rather they extol and praise it. Still, the Jews and the Christians do fast on various days in the year, in various ways, like abstaining from meat, or milk, or food and drink. There are stories in the Qur'an of the fasts of Zachariah and Mary in which they abstained from talking.

Fasting was also observed in traditional (unrevealed) religions, as is reported from ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome. The Hindus observe fasts even now. Apparently, it is human nature itself that leads one to believe that the fast is an act of worship which brings one nearer to the Creator.

Sometimes it is said that those before you means the Jews and the Christians; or that it refers to only the previous prophets (and not their followers). The basis of these assertions are some traditions which are not free from weakness.

So that you may guard yourselves: That is, so that you may guard yourselves against evil or, so that you may become pious. Idol-worshippers fasted to please their deities, or, on committing a sin, to extinguish their deities' anger, or to get their prayers granted. This turns the fast into a trade or barter; the man performs what is needed by the deity and the deity in its turn grants the prayers of the man; the worshipper pleases the deity so that the deity may do what will please the worshipper.

But God is All-holiness. No want, need, emotion or grievance can be attributed to Him even in imagination. In short, He is free from every shortcoming. So, all the good effects of the worship (whatever the act of worship and whatever the good results) return to the worshipper himself, not to the Lord. The same is the case of sins. God has said: *If you do good, you do good for your own souls, and if you do evil it is for them [only]* (17:7). It is this principle which the Qur'an teaches by always connecting the effects of good and evil actions with man: man, who is all needs and wants, as God says o man! *You are the ones who stand in need of Allah, and Allah is He who is the Self-sufficient* (35:15); and refers to the fact specifically in connection with fasting in the words, so that you may become pious (may guard your selves against evil).

There is no doubt that one may achieve piety through fasting. Everyone naturally feels that for union with the sublime world of holiness and for rising to the height of perfection and spirituality man should first of all restrain himself from gratifying material desires. He should keep away from satisfying the body's lust and inclinations, and purge his soul from the love of worldly affairs. In short, he should guard himself against all such things which may carry him away from his Lord. This is piety (*taqwā*) which is achieved through abstinence from lust and desires.

Even more beneficial and more effective for the common man is the abstinence from common lawful desires like food, drink and sex. This trains him to keep away from unlawful things; and creates in him the will to guard himself against sin and evil, and to come nearer to God. Obviously, when he accepts the words of God by abstaining from lawful desires, and heeds to and obeys His commandment, he will be more

needful and obedient to His words in connection with sins and unlawful things.

أَيَّامًا مَعْدُودَاتٍ ۚ فَمَنْ كَانَ مِنْكُمْ مَرِيضًا أَوْ عَلَىٰ سَفَرٍ فَعِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَيَّامٍ أُخَرَ ۚ وَعَلَى
الَّذِينَ يُطِيقُونَهُ فِدْيَةٌ طَعَامُ مِسْكِينٍ ۖ فَمَنْ تَطَوَّعَ خَيْرًا فَهُوَ خَيْرٌ لَهُ ۚ وَأَنْ تَصُومُوا
خَيْرٌ لَكُمْ ۖ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ ﴿١٨٤﴾

(2:184) ***for a counted number of days* (ayyāman maʿdūdātin)*; but whoso among you be sick or on a journey than [he shall fast] that number of other days; and those who are with difficulty able to do so, on them is a redemption by feeding a poor man, and whoso on his own accord performs good, it is better for him, and that you fast is better for you if you know.***

Ayyāman has the vowel of (*fatḥah,*) because an adverb of time, in (*fī,*) is understood before it. It is connected with the word fast (*ṣiyām,*). It has already been explained that bringing the word "days" as a common noun and attaching to it the adjective, "counted," implies that the order given is not very difficult or bothersome. This in turn encourages the man to obedience. Also it has been maintained that the words, *the month of Ramaḍān* … are the explanation of "days." So, the meaning of, *counted number of days* is the month of Ramaḍān.

Some commentators have said that the words, *counted number of days*, mean three days in every month and the fast of the day of *ʿĀshūrāʾ* (10th day of Muharram). Some others have said that it is the 13th, 14th and 15th days of every month plus the fast of *ʿĀshūrāʾ*. According to them, the Messenger of God and the Muslims used to fast on these days, then God revealed the verses the month of Ramaḍān in which was sent down the Qur'an … and this verse abrogated the previous system and made the fast of Ramaḍān obligatory. These commentators rely on many traditions of the Sunnis—traditions which contradict each other.

There are many things which prove the falsity of these assertions:

First: Fasting is a common act of worship involving the whole *ummah*. Had there been a system, at any time, of fasting for three days in a month, it would have been recorded in history, and there would not have been any difference about its ordination and then abrogation. But it is not so.

Moreover, saying that the fast of the day of *ʿĀshūrāʾ* was obligatory (or even desirable), like the fast of the three days of every month, is the

innovation of the Umayyads (May God curse them). They wiped out the grandson of the Messenger of God and his family-members on the day of *ʿĀshūrāʾ*; they killed their men-folk, imprisoned their women and children and looted their belongings in the battle of Karbalāʾ; and then they regarded it as a blessed auspicious day. They took that day as an *ʿīd* (festival), started its fast to obtain its supposed blessings, and then invented for it many virtues and excellences. They forged many traditions showing that it was an Islamic festival. They went even further and said that it was a common festival which had been observed even by the pagans of Arabia, as well as by the Jews and the Christians since the advent of Moses and Jesus. But all these assertions are baseless. This day has no national importance like the Nowrūz of the Persians, nor did there occur any victory or important event on that day to make it an Islamic festival (like the Day of the first revelation or the Birthday of the Prophet) nor has it any religious aspect which could make it a purely religious festival like *ʿĪd al-fiṭr* and *ʿĪd al-aḍḥā*. So how could it be given importance without any reason?

Second: The context makes it impossible to say that the 3rd verse, that is, the month of Ramaḍān …, was revealed alone, to abrogate the first two verses. As mentioned earlier, it is the predicate of a deleted but understood subject, or the subject of a deleted but implied predicate. Thus it is a clarification of the words, counted number of days, and all three verses are one inter-related speech with a single aim, that is, the promulgation of the obligatory fast of the month of Ramaḍān.

Those commentators claim that the phrase, month of Ramaḍān, is the subject and words, in which was sent down the Qur'an, are its predicate. If we accept this claim then this third verse would become an independent sentence, capable of being revealed alone. But then it could not abrogate the previous two verses, because there would be no contradiction between this verse and the previous ones; and no verse can abrogate another when there is no contradiction between them.

Even weaker than this is another view, which appears in some writings. It says that the second verse, for a counted number of days, abrogated the first verse, *Fasting has been prescribed for you…* They claim that fasting was prescribed for the Christians, but they went on changing its number after Jesus until finally it was settled as fifty days. God then ordained it for the Muslims by the first verse, and people fasted accordingly in the beginning of Islam, until the second verse counted number of days was

revealed and the new system was introduced abrogating the first order. This view is clearly weaker and more false than the previous ones and all the objections mentioned therein apply here also. Clearly the second verse is complementary to and a continuation of the first verse. The traditions upon which these people have based their views are obviously against the clear meaning and context of the Qur'an.

But whoso among you be sick or on a journey then [he shall fast] that number of other days: *Fa* (then, but, so, and, etc.) here is for derivation. It means that the sentence is an off-shoot of *Fasting has been prescribed on you and for a counted number of days*. The fast is written down and obligatory and the number is a part of that obligation. The basic obligation (fast) cannot be neglected and the same is the case of the prescribed number. Even if for any reason like sickness or journey the obligation of fasting during the counted number of days (that is, month of Ramaḍān) is waived, the obligation of fasting an equal number of days after that month will still be enforced, in order to make up for the lost days of Ramaḍān. It is this principle which has been mentioned in the 3rd verse and so that you may complete the (prescribed) number. Here we find another significance of the phrase, counted number of days; it implies that the order given is not very difficult, and also it shows that the number is an integral part of the said obligation.

"Sickness" is the opposite of "health." *Safar* (journey,) is derived from a root-word which means to uncover. It is as though the traveller is uncovered by going out of his house which is his refuge and shelter.

God used the words, on a journey, and did not say a traveler; it shows that for the purpose of this rule one must be on a journey presently. Past travel or a travel which is yet to start (that is, to commence later) would not make one entitled to this concession.

Most of the Sunni scholars say that this sentence shows only that a sick person or a traveler is allowed, but not compelled, leave the fast. According to them, a sick person or a traveler has the choice of fasting or not fasting. But, as has been explained earlier, the meaning of then that number of other days is that he is (not only allowed but is) 'compelled' not to fast during the originally prescribed days; he must fast that number of "other days." This is narrated from the Imams of the Ahl al-Bayt. Also, it is the ruling of a group of the companions of the Prophet like ʿAbdu al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwf, ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar,

Abū Hurayrah and ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr. The Sunni scholars say that this sentence means: "but whoever among you be sick or on a journey (and did not fast) then (he shall fast) that number of other days." Thus they suppose that there is a deleted but implied verb in this sentence. But this supposition is incorrect because:

First: such a supposition is against the apparent meaning. A deletion can be accepted only when the context demands it; and the context of this sentence does not need any such thing.

Second: even if we accept this implied verb, it will not mean that a sick person or a traveler has only an option to break his fast. In these verses God is promulgating a law and in this context the hypothetical, implied words, and did not fast will mean that during sickness or journey, breaking one's fast is not a sin, rather it is lawful. The word 'lawful' is a general one, meaning all or any of its three kinds: obligatory, recommended and allowed. There is no reason to suppose that in this context it would mean only "allowed" (to the exclusion of the other two meanings). Rather there is a reason against such a supposition, because the Wise Law-Giver when promulgating a law cannot leave one of its important and obligatory aspects.

… and those who are with difficulty able to do so on them is a redemption, by feeding a poor man: 'Spending one's active strength in a work' (*iṭāqah*,) is the meaning explained by some scholars. It necessarily means that the work would be done with difficulty and by overstraining oneself. *Fidyah* means a substitute. Here it is a material substitute, that is, food for a poor man. The word implies a food which satiates a hungry poor man; and it should be the normal food of the man.

The rule of the substitute also is obligatory, like the rule of repaying a fast afterward for the sick or the traveller. It is shown by the words, 'on those' (*ʿalaʾl-ladhīna*,) which is obviously for obligation and not merely for option or choice.

Some people have said that this sentence gave the people an option and then it was abrogated. According to them, God had given all those who were able to fast an option to keep the fast or to redeem it by feeding every day a poor man, because in the beginning people were not accustomed to fast. Then it was abrogated by the sentence, So whosoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast therein. Some of those writers said that this verse abrogated the option so far as able persons were concerned.

But the rule regarding those who were unable to fast (like extremely old persons, pregnant women and women who are suckling a baby) remained unabrogated and they could give the substitute.

By God, such an explanation is nothing but playing with the Qur'an and cutting and chopping up the verses into shreds and fragments. If you study these 3 verses, you will see that it is all a well-connected speech, delivered with one aim, all in one context only. its sentences are connected with each other, having a sweetness and flow of their own. But if you cut it into pieces and accept these people's interpretation then everything will fall out of context and some phrases will contradict others; the latter sentences will clash with the former ones. According to their explanation, first it says 'Fasting is prescribed for you,' then it says that 'those who are able to fast have an option to fast or to redeem it by a substitute'; then it goes on to say that 'fasting is obligatory for all of you when you witness the month'; then it abrogates the rule of redemption for able persons and keeps it unchanged for unable ones (while the fact remains that even before the supposed abrogation that verse was not concerned at all with those who were unable. They want us to believe that the single word meaning 'those who are with difficulty able to do so (*yuṭīqūnahu*,) referred, before the abrogation, to those who were able to fast; and now after abrogation the same word means 'those who are unable to fast'! In short, according to these commentators, those who are with difficulty able to do so in the middle of the verse would abrogate fasting is prescribed for you which is in the beginning of the verse, because both would be contradictory to each other; but the question would arise why that abrogation was made conditional on ability without any apparent reason. Then again the sentence, So whosoever of you witnesses the month he shall fast therein, at the end of the verse, would abrogate those who are with difficulty able which is in the middle. Still the question would arise as to how it abrogated that rule for only those who were able to fast and not for those who were unable to do so, when the verse is unconditional and comprehensive and covers able and unable persons alike. Interestingly enough, the supposedly abrogated verse in itself did not cover those who were unable. This is its most obviously absurdity.

Add to it their assertion that the words, *the month of Ramaḍān* …, abrogated the words, counted number of days, which in their turn abrogated the words, *Fast has been prescribed for you*; and then ponder with this

background upon the meaning of the verses and you will be astonished! Nothing of the verses would remain intact; all would have been abrogated!!

… and whosoever on his own accord performs good it is better for him: 'To do work willingly and gladly' (*taṭawwuᶜ*,) is of the form *tafaᶜul* from *ṭawuᶜ* which is the opposite of 'to dislike' (*kurh*). The meaning of acceptance is implied in the form *tafaᶜul*; therefore, the meaning of *taṭawwuᶜ* is 'the present doing of work willingly and gladly without reluctance or annoyance, whether that work is obligatory or not.' The use of this word especially for non-obligatory good work was established among the Muslims long after the revelation of the Qur'an, and this later usage is based on the view that it is only non-obligatory good work which is done willingly without compulsion, while there is a shade of compulsion in obligatory work: because there is no choice, it has to be done. Anyhow, the word *taṭawwuᶜ* in its root or form, was not used only for non-obligatory good work.

The preposition for derivation is here represented by *fa* … (and, so, and so on), and the sentence is an off-shoot of the previous sentences. Thus its meaning is: Fasting is prescribed for you, keeping in view your good and betterment, with the additional advantage that it brings you in line with previous peoples, and it has been made easy for you; therefore you should perform it willingly, to do it thus rather than doing it reluctantly.

It appears from the above that the words of God: *whoso performs good willingly* have metaphorically put the 'cause' in the place of 'effect.' It says that to perform good willingly is better for him, instead of saying that to fast willingly is better. It is like the verse, *Indeed We know, it certainly grieves thee that which they say, but verily it is not thee that they belie, but it the signs of Allah which the wrongdoers deny* (6:33), which means "so endure it and do not be grieved because they do not deny, thee…"

Sometimes it is said that the sentence, *whoso willingly performs good it is better for him*, is connected with the preceding sentence, that is, those who are with difficulty able to do so, on them is a redemption by feeding a poor man. According to this interpretation it means that whoso performs non-obligatory good work by giving redemption twice—feeds one poor man twice or two poor man once—it is better for him.

But there are three defects in this interpretation:

First: As mentioned earlier, there is no evidence to show that the word meaning 'to do a work willingly' (*taṭawwuᶜ*) is reserved for non-obligatory

good work.

Second: In this interpretation *fa …* would be without any real significance. It has been mentioned above that the sentence is an off-shoot of the previous sentence. But what is the connection between the rule of redemption and giving non-obligatory food on one's own accord?

Third: This interpretation confuses adding something on one's own accord with performing good willingly. But obviously these are two separate things.

… and that you fast is better for you if you know: This sentence is complementary to the preceding one; and the meaning is: Perform willingly the fast which is prescribed for you because willingly doing a good deed is in itself another good work, and the fast is good for you, therefore, to fast willingly is good twice.

Sometimes it is said that the sentence, and that you fast is better for you, is addressed to those who are excused from fasting and not to the other believers who are obliged to fast and for whom the fast is compulsory. They say that its apparent meaning is that fasting is better for you, but there would be no objection if you do not fast. Obviously this meaning can fit the non-obligatory fast only, and not the obligatory one. The implication is that those who have the option not to fast (like a sick person or a traveller) are exhorted to fast and it is recommended to them to keep the fast rather than to break it.

There are five objections to this interpretation:

First: There is no evidence to support this view.

Second: The two sentences differ in syntax. The pronoun in *whoso among you be sick …* is in the 3rd person, and those in *and that you fast …* are in the 2nd person.

Third: The first sentence does not give any option to the sick man or the traveller. On the contrary, the words, then (he shall fast) that number of other days, obviously specify fasting on other days, as explained earlier.

Fourth: Even if we accept, for the sake of argument, that the first sentence gives an option to the sick person and the traveller, that option is not between fasting and not fasting; it is between fasting in Ramaḍān and fasting on other days. And as both options are of a fast in different periods, merely the words, that you fast is better for you, cannot prove (in the absence of a clear context) any preference for fasting in Ramaḍān over fasting on other days.

Fifth: God in this sentence is not promulgating any law, so that it may be argued that the description of the preference of fasting shows that in this particular case it is not obligatory. Rather, according to the context of this verse, its aim is to emphasise that the law given by God cannot be devoid of benefit, good and advantage for you. Other examples of this style may be seen in many verses, like, *therefore turn to your Creator and kill your selves; that is better for you* (2:54); *then hasten to the remembrance of Allah and leave off trading; that is better for you, if you know* (62:9); *you shall believe in Allah and His messengers, and struggle hard in Allah's way with your properties and your lives; that is better for you if you know* (61:11). And there are many such verses which show that this style of speech in the Qur'an does not give an option to the believer, it only shows that a given order is for their own advantage and benefit.

شَهْرُ رَمَضَانَ الَّذِي أُنْزِلَ فِيهِ الْقُرْآنُ هُدًى لِلنَّاسِ وَبَيِّنَاتٍ مِنَ الْهُدَىٰ وَالْفُرْقَانِ
فَمَنْ شَهِدَ مِنْكُمُ الشَّهْرَ فَلْيَصُمْهُ ۖ وَمَنْ كَانَ مَرِيضًا أَوْ عَلَىٰ سَفَرٍ فَعِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَيَّامٍ
أُخَرَ ۗ يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ بِكُمُ الْيُسْرَ وَلَا يُرِيدُ بِكُمُ الْعُسْرَ وَلِتُكْمِلُوا الْعِدَّةَ وَلِتُكَبِّرُوا
اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ مَا هَدَاكُمْ وَلَعَلَّكُمْ تَشْكُرُونَ ﴿١٨٥﴾

(2:185) ***The month of Ramadan, in which was sent down the Qur'an, a guidance for the people, and clear evidence of guidance and discrimination [between right and wrong]; so whosoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast therein; and whosoever is sick or on a journey [he shall fast] the same number of other days; Allah desires ease for you and He desires not hardship for you; and so that you may complete the [prescribed] number, and that you may glorify Allah for his guiding you, and so that you may be thankful to Him.***

The month of Ramaḍān is the ninth month of the lunar Arabic calendar, between the months of *Shaʿbān* and *Shawwāl*. No other month has been mentioned by name in the Qur'an. The word meaning 'to come down' is *nuzūl*. Its transitive forms meaning 'to bring down' are *inzāl* and *tanzīl*; the difference between them is that *inzāl* implies bringing down all at once, while *tanzīl* implies bringing down gradually.

The Qur'an is the name of the book sent down to His Prophet Muḥammad, because it is recited and read. (It is derived from the root

form *qaraʾa* (meaning to read or recite.) God has said: *Surely We made it an Arabic Qur'an that you may understand* (43:3). This name is used for the whole book as well as for its parts.

The verse proves that the Qur'an was sent down in the month of Ramaḍān. But God has also said, *And the Qur'an which We revealed in portions so that you may read it to the people by slow degrees, and We sent it down sending it [in portions]* (17:106). And this verse clearly shows that it was revealed gradually during the entire period of the Call, which was about twenty-three years. Also accepted history proves it. This has apparently given room to the objection that there was a complete conflict between these two verses.

Some people have replied that the Qur'an was sent down all at once to the lowest heaven in the month of Ramaḍān, then was revealed to the Messenger of God in portions, gradually, over about twenty-three years—the total period of the Call. This reply is based on some traditions, some of which will be quoted during the discussion of traditions.

Others have objected to this reply. They say that the words a guidance for mankind, and clear evidence of guidance and distinction which come immediately after these words do not support this interpretation; it is difficult to understand how the Qur'an guided the people and was a source of discrimination between truth and falsehood during the time when it was in the heaven for years and years. This objection has been answered in this way: The Qur'an is a guidance and a discrimination; it means that it had the potential and ability to guide those who needed its guidance and to discriminate between the truth and falsehood if there was any confusion. It could remain with that hidden potential for a while until the time came for that potential to become a fact. There are countless examples in civil laws and state constitutions where many articles remain on paper until the occasion arises for their enforcement and they are then acted upon.

But we must admit that there is a great difference between constitutions and civil laws on one hand, and addresses and lectures on the other. Lectures or talks cannot be delivered a single moment before their time and occasion, and there are in the Qur'an numerous verses of this type. For example: *Allah surely heard the plea of her who pleads with you about her husband and complains to Allah, and Allah knows the contentions of both of you …* (58:1); *And when they see merchandise or sport, they break up for it and leave you standing …* (62:11); *Of the believers are men who*

are true to the covenant which they made with Allah: so of them is he who accomplished his vow, and of them is he who yet waits, and they have not changed in the least (33:23). Moreover, the Qur'an contains verses which have been abrogated and other that abrogated them, and there is no sense in combining both of them in revelation sent all together.

Another interpretation is that the declaration that the Qur'an was sent down in the month of Ramaḍān means that its first verses were revealed at that time.

It is difficult to accept this interpretation either. It is well known that the Prophet was sent with the Qur'an, and the beginning of his Call was on the 27th Rajab, and there is between this date and Ramaḍān a gap of more than thirty days. How could the prophethood remain without the revelation of the Qur'an for such a long period? Look at the 96th Chapter which was the first chapter revealed (*Read in the name of your Lord …*). Its context shows that it was revealed at the beginning of the Call. Likewise, the contents of the 74th Chapter show that this also was revealed at the beginning.

Anyhow, the words, *the month of Ramaḍān in which was sent down the Qur'an*, obviously do not mean that only the first verses were revealed at that time; and there is no such indication in the context. Therefore, such explanation would be without any proof or evidence. Also there are some more verses which have similar meaning. For example: *By the Book that makes manifest [the truth], Surely We sent it down on a blessed night; Surely We are ever-warning* (44:2-3); *and Surely We sent it down on the Night of Destiny* (97:1). Neither the apparent meanings of these verses nor their contexts support the view that sending down of the Qur'an means the beginning of its revelation or the revealing its first verses.

Deep consideration of the verses of the Book shows something quite different from all the above interpretations. The verses which say that the Qur'an was sent down in the month of Ramaḍān, have used the verbal form of *inzāl* which indicates sending down all at once (Qur'an 2:185; 44:23; 97:1). This "all at once" can mean either of two things:

(1) To consider the complete book as one collection and look at it as a collective noun, as God says in 10:24, *Like the water which we sent down from the sky*. Now, the rain comes down gradually, but it is looked upon as one whole collection and that is why the verbal form *inzāl*, and not *tanzīl*, has been used. The same is the meaning of the verse, *[this is] a book We*

have sent down to you abounding in good, so that they may ponder over its verses … (38:29) in which the whole book has been taken as one collection and the verbal form *inzāl* has been used.

(2) To accept that the reality of the Book is something different from the words written on paper, and so on. Its common meaning gives the picture of a thing which can be divided and sectionalized and which can be a subject of expansion and graduality, but the reality of the Book is a single, non-gradual thing which was sent down all at once, and not in pieces.

This second meaning is apparent in many verses of the Qur'an. See for example the verses, *[This is] a book whose verses were confirmed, then they were divided [made clear] from One Wise All-aware* (11:1). "Strengthened" or "confirmed" (*uḥkimat*,) is the opposite of "divided," "made clear" (*fuṣṣilat*). The literal meaning of *tafṣīl* is to divide into parts and sections; that is why it implies explanation and clarification. Therefore, confirmed (*uḥkimat*,) would mean that in that state it was indivisible and indistinguishable in its parts, because it was a single unit without any part of section. The sequence of the words in this verse shows that this division which we find in the Qur'an came to it later; before that, it was some thing confirmed, undivided and one.

More clear are the verses, *And certainly, We have brought them a Book which We have 'sectionalized'* (that is, explained) *with knowledge, a guidance and a mercy for the people who believe. Do they wait for aught but its final interpretation? On the day when its final interpretation comes about, those who neglected it before will say: Indeed the messengers of our Lord had brought the truth* … (7:52-53). Also the verses, *And this Qur'an is not such as could be forged by those besides Allah, but it is a verification of that which is before it and a 'sectionalization'* (explanation) *of the Book, there is no doubt in it, for the Lord of the worlds … Nay, they rejected that of which they have not comprehensive knowledge, and its final interpretation has not yet come to them* … (10:37-38). These verses, and especially the last one, clearly show that the division into parts is a thing which came later unto the Book. Therefore, the reality of the Book is one thing and the division which it was subjected to is another. The unbelievers rejected the division (explanation) of the Book because they neglected (forgot) something to which that explanation led and which has been referred to here as the "final interpretation," and which will appear before them on the Day of Judgement and, at that time, they will inevitably know it, but then their

regret will not benefit them, and it is too late to repent. These verses also imply that the real Book is the final interpretation of the Book.

Even far more clear are the verses, *By the Book which makes manifest [the truth], surely We made it an Arabic Qur'an that you may understand, and surely it is in the Source of the Book with Us truly elevated, full of Wisdom* (43:2-4).

almizan.org

It is apparent that there is a Book which makes manifest the truth, which was later made into an Arabic Qur'an (Recited thing); and it was clothed in recited words and Arabic language so that people might understand; but in reality it is in the Source of the Book with God, elevated, so that minds do not reach it, full of wisdom without any division. This verse contains the definition of the Manifest Book and that it is the foundation of the Qur'an revealed later in plain Arabic.

In the same way God says in 56:75-80, *But nay! I swear by the falling of stars—and most surely it is a great oath if you only know—Most surely it is an honored Qur'an in a Hidden Book, none touches it save the purified ones; A sending down* (revelation) *from the Lord of the worlds.* These verses clearly show that the Qur'an has its own place, in the *Hidden Book*, where none touches it save the purified servants of God, and it was only later that it was sent down. But before being sent down it was in a Book which is hidden from others. It is that *Hidden Book* which was referred to as the Source of the Book in 43:2-4. The verse 85:21-22 calls that Source the Guarded Tablet: *Nay! It is a Glorious Qur'an in a Guarded Tablet*. This tablet is called Guarded because it is preserved and protected from changes; but we know that in the Qur'an which was sent down gradually there are verses abrogating other verses; gradual completion itself is a sort of change. So this Qur'an cannot be called the Guarded Tablet. In short, the Manifest Book is the foundation of this Qur'an and this Qur'an is like a clothing to that Reality.

almizan.org

Now we know that the relation of this Qur'an, when it was gradually revealed, to the Manifest Book—which we call the Reality of the Book—is that of a dress to its wearer, and of a metaphor to its real meaning, and of a proverb to its actual aim. It is because of this relationship that the word Qur'an is sometimes used for the Real Book itself, as in the divine words, Nay! It is a Glorious Qur'an in a Guarded Tablet, and in other similar verses. Therefore, we may correctly interpret the 'sending down of the Qur'an,' in the three verses, where it is said that it was revealed in

the month of Ramaḍān (2:185), on a blessed night (44:3), on the Night of Destiny (97:1), as the revelation of the Source of the Book, that is, the Manifest Book to the heart of the Messenger of God all at once. And the sectionalized Qur'an was revealed to his heart gradually during the entire period of his prophetic Call.

This can be better appreciated when we study some other verses. God says, *and do not make haste with the Qur'an before its revelation is made complete to you…* (20:114) Also He says: *Do not move your tongue with it to make haste with it; surely on Us is the collecting of it and the reciting of it. Therefore, when We have recited it, then follow its recitation; again on Us is the explaining of it* (75:16-19). These verses prove without any shadow of doubt that the Messenger of God had prior knowledge of what was being revealed to him. That is why he was asked not to make haste in reciting before its revelation was completed. (This matter will be further explained, God willing, in its proper place)

In short, after pondering on the verses of the Qur'an one can not but accept that:

This Qur'an which was gradually revealed to the Prophet is based on a sublime Reality which the minds of common people cannot comprehend and the hands of defiled imaginations (defiled with lust, greed and materialism) cannot touch. That sublime Reality was revealed to the Prophet all at once in the month of Ramaḍān. And in this way God taught him the real goal and meaning of the Book. (This subject will be explained under the verse 3:7.)

This is what a deep consideration of the verses of the Qur'an leads one to believe. Of course, the traditionalists, and most of the theologians as well as the materialists (who do not accept the reality of metaphysics, the things beyond the matter) have no way but to interpret these and the like verses (such as the verses which say that the Qur'an is a guidance, mercy, light, spirit, setting-place of the stars, manifest book, in a guarded tablet, sent down from God, in purified pages and so on) as metaphorical and figurative expressions. Thus they have turned the Qur'an into poetic prose!!

A writer has discussed the meaning of the revelation of the Qur'an in the month of Ramaḍān. What follows is the gist of his writing; our comment will follow thereafter:

"There is no doubt that the beginning of the Call of the Prophet coincided with the revelation of the first revealed verses of the Qur'an, and

with his being asked by God to announce the truth and warn the people. Also, there is no doubt that this happened in the night, as God says, *Surely We sent it down on a blessed night* (44:3). Again, there is no doubt that it was in a night of the month of Ramaḍān as God says, *the month of Ramaḍān, in which was sent down the Qur'an (*2:185)

"The whole Qur'an was not revealed on that night; but as the Chapter of The Opening was revealed in it, and this chapter covers all the features and knowledge of the Qur'an, it was as though the whole Qur'an was revealed therein. (Moreover, the name "Qur'an" is used for parts of the Book as well as for the complete book. Further, it is used in Qur'anic terminology for all divine books like the Torah, the Gospel, the Psalms and so on.)

"The first revelation was, *Read in the name of Thy Lord …* (96:1), which was sent down on the 25th night of Ramaḍān. It was revealed when the Prophet was proceeding to the house of Khadījah in the middle of the valley, looking at Gabriel, who revealed to him the divine words, *Read in the name of Thy Lord Who created …* When the Prophet received the revelation, it came into his mind to ask Gabriel how to remember the name of his Lord. So, Gabriel appeared before him and taught him the Chapter of the Opening, *In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful, All praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of the worlds …* Then he taught him the method of prayer and disappeared. Then the Prophet regained consciousness, and did not find any trace of what he had witnessed except a fatigue which had overcome him because Gabriel had pressed him hard at the time of revelation. Now, the Prophet continued on his way but he did not realize that he was sent by God as His Messenger to mankind, commissioned to guide them unto the right path. When he entered the house, he slept the whole night because of weariness. In the morning, the angel returned and brought the revelation of God, *O thou shrouded [in thy mantle!] Arise, and warn …* (74:1-2)."

Then he goes on to say:

"This is the meaning of revealing the Qur'an in the month of Ramaḍān, and the coincidence of his Call with the Night of Destiny. As for the assertion of some Shī'ite books that the start of the Call was on the 27th day of Rajab, these traditions (which are only found in some Shī'ite books which were not written before the beginning of the 4th century of *Hijrah*) are against the Qur'an, as you know."

Then he says:

"And there are other traditions which support these (Shīʿite) traditions and say that the meaning of the revelation of the Qur'an in the month of Ramaḍān is that it was sent down, before the beginning of the Call of the Prophet, from the Guarded Tablet to the Inhabited House, and there Gabriel dictated it to the angels so that it might be sent down to the Prophet after the beginning of his Call. But these mythological ideas which have been interpolated into the traditions are rejected, first, because they are against the Qur'an, and second, because the guarded tablet mentioned in the Qur'an means the physical world, and the inhabited house means the earth because mankind lives therein."

This was the gist of his writing; and, by my life, I do not know which sentence in this balderdash can be amended to conform with fact and reality. The damage is too extensive to be repaired.

First: It is a strange fabrication which he has uttered about the beginning of the prophethood and the revelation of the Qur'an for the first time. Where did he find that *Read in the name of Thy Lord …* was revealed to the Prophet when he was on his way; and that the Chapter of the Opening was revealed to him then and there; and at the same time he was taught the prayer, and that thereafter he entered his house and slept weary and tired, and then in the morning the Chapter of *al-Muddaththir* (The Shrouded) was revealed asking him to announce his prophethood and warn the people? All of this is just his imagination which has no basis at all; neither any clear verse nor any tradition of any standing supports it. It is just a mythological story which conforms with neither the Qur'an nor the traditions, as you will see.

Second: He claims that it is accepted that the beginning of the prophethood and the revelation of the Qur'an as well as the command to announce his prophethood, all happened at one and the same time. Then he explains it by saying that the prophethood started with the revelation of the Qur'an; and the Prophet was a Prophet without being a Messenger for one night, then in the morning he was given Messengership when the 74th Chapter (The Shrouded) was revealed. But the writer cannot show any evidence to support himself either from the Qur'an or from the traditions; and what he claims to be "accepted" is not accepted at all.

As for the traditions, what he has criticized the Shīʿite collections for (that they were written long after the incident) equally discredits all other

collections of traditions and no trust can be had in any of them, because not a single book of the traditions, whether of the Sunnis or the Shias, was written before the expiry of the second century of *Hijrah* or even later. This much about the traditions. The position of history—which, by the way, does not give the above details—is worse than the traditions. And the criticism of interpolation which he has levelled against the traditions must be directed against history also.

So far as the Qur'an is concerned, it does not support any of his assertions. On the other hand, it plainly contradicted what he has said and refutes what he has fabricated. The 96th Chapter (*Read in the name of Thy Lord …*) is the first one revealed, as has been described by the traditions and is proved by the meaning of the first five verses; and nobody has said that this chapter was revealed piecemeal, (at least there is a likelihood that the whole chapter was revealed all together). Now, this chapter clearly shows that the Prophet used to pray in the presence of the Meccans, some of whom forbade him to do so and talked about him their gatherings. (We do not know the method of the prayer which the Prophet performed in the beginning of his Call to be nearer to God, except that this chapter mentions prostration.) Look at these verses of this chapter: *Did you see him who forbids a Servant [of Allah] when he prays? Have you considered if he [the Servant] were on the Guidance or enjoined guarding [against evil]? Have you considered if he [the unbeliever] gives the lie [to the truth] and turns [his] back? Did he not know that Allah does see? Nay! If he desist not, We will certainly smite his forehead; a lying sinful forehead. Then let him summon his council; We too will summon the tormentors of Hell. Nay! Obey him not, and prostrate and draw nigh [to Allah]* (95:9-19). These verses show that there was someone who used to forbid a worshipper to pray, and used to mention this matter in his council and did not desist from his deed; and obviously the one who used to pray was the Prophet himself, especially as God directly addresses him in the last verse, *Obey him not, and prostrate and draw nigh [to Allah]*. This chapter, therefore, proves that the Prophet used to pray even before the revelation of the first Chapter of the Qur'an, and was a Guidance, and enjoined piety and guarding against evil. In other words, his work at that time consisted of prophethood and was not just a warning. In short, even before the Qur'an was revealed, and the Chapter of the Opening sent down to Muḥammad, and even before he was told to start his Call, he was a Prophet and used to pray.

So far as the Chapter of the Opening is concerned, it was revealed some time after the beginning of the Call. Had there been any truth in the assertion of the above writer that it was revealed just after the 94th Chapter because "it came into the Prophet's mind to ask Gabriel how to remember God," it would have begun with the word "say" (*qul*): Say, in the name of God … or Say, all praise belongs to God …; and would have ended at the words, Master of the Day of Judgement, because the last three verses have no relation with that supposed question, and it is not the style of the Qur'an to indulge in unnecessary talk. Of course, a verse in the 15th Chapter (al-Hijr) says: *And certainly We have given you seven oft-repeated [verses] and the great Qur'an* (15-87). This chapter is of Meccan period as its subject matter shows. Seven oft-repeated verses means the Chapter of the Opening, and it has been mentioned here side by side with the Qur'an, which shows its greatness and excellence. Yet it was not counted as the Qur'an, but only as seven of its oft-repeated verses, and only one of its parts. For further proof see 39:23 where the Qur'an has been given the adjective, "oft-repeated": *Allah has revealed the best discourse, a Book conforming in its various parts, oft-repeated …* Thus, the Qur'an is "oft-repeated" and the Chapter of the Opening is only seven of its verses.

The 15th Chapter mentions the 1st Chapter (the Opening). It proves that the 1st Chapter was revealed before the 15th. And the 15th Chapter contains the verses; *Therefore, declare openly what you are bidden and turn aside from the polytheists. Surely, We will suffice you against the scoffers* (15:94-95). These verses show that the Messenger of God had refrained from openly warning for a time and then was told to start it again by the words, *declare openly*.

Now let us look at the 74th Chapter (the Shrouded) and its 2nd verse, *Arise, and warn.* If this chapter was revealed all together, then this verse has the same implication as the verse declare openly what you are bidden (15:94) because this chapter contains the following verses: *Leave Me and him whom I created alone and gave him vast riches … Then he turned back and was big with pride and, then he said, this is naught but an enchantment narrated …* (74:11-25) This subject matter is similar to 15:94 which says, *and turn aside from the polytheists*. And if it was revealed piecemeal, then the context says that at least the verses in its beginning were revealed in the early days of the Call, after the Prophet had refrained from an open warning for some time.

Thirdly: He asserts that those traditions are forged and mythological which say that the Qur'an was sent down on the Night of Destiny from the Preserved Tablet to the Inhabited House all together before the beginning of the Prophethood and then its verses were revealed in segments to the Messenger of God. He says that they are against the Book of God and their meaning is not correct. He claims that the Preserved Tablet means the Natural World and the Inhabited House means the Earth. Well, all the above claims are incorrect and a complete lie:

First, because no clear verse of the Qur'an goes against these traditions as has been explained earlier.

Second, because nowhere in these traditions has it been said that the Qur'an was sent down to the Inhabited House before the beginning of the prophethood. This clause has been added by the said writer without any basis.

Third: His assertion that the Preserved Tablet means the natural world (that is, the universe) is a very ugly interpretation; nay, rather it is a laughing-stock. Can he explain what is the basis of naming this universe—in the word of God—as 'the Preserved Tablet'? Is this because this universe is free from change and alteration? But it is a world of movement, always in a state of fluidity, always changing its quality. Or is it because this universe is safe from physical deterioration? But the facts belie such a claim. Or is it because undeserving persons cannot have any knowledge of it (as God says in 56:77-79, *Most surely it is an honored Qur'an, in a book that is protected; none shall touch it save the purified ones*)? But the knowledge of the universe is not restricted to any one group.

In short, that writer did not produce any interpretation, concerning the revelation of Qur'an in the month of Ramaḍān, which could be in accord with the words of the verse. His interpretation boils down to this: The words, *in it was sent down the Qur'an*, mean "it is as though in it was sent down the Qur'an." And the words, *Surely We revealed it in the Night of Destiny* mean "It is as though We revealed it in the Night of Destiny." Any such interpretation cannot be tolerated by language, usage and context.

Further, that writer says that the whole Qur'an was revealed to the Messenger of God in the Night of Destiny because he was given in that night the Chapter of the Opening which contains all the important knowledge of the Qur'an. Well why cannot others say that the revelation of the Qur'an all at one time means that all its knowledge was sent down to the

heart of the Messenger of God in that night? There is nothing to contradict this interpretation.

There are many other fabrications and lies in that writing but this is not the place to go into a detailed refutation of it.

… a guidance for the people and clear evidence of guidance and discrimination [between right and wrong]: "People" generally refers to the lowest category of mankind whose intelligence is not high. This word is generally used in the Qur'an with this very implication. For example, *but most people do not know* (30:30); *And these examples, We set them forth for the people and none understand them but the learned (*29:43). This word generally refers to the people who just follow what others say; they cannot understand abstract ideas even with the help of evidence and proof; they cannot discriminate between right and wrong through any argument; they need someone to explain ideals and a guide to lead them to the right path. And the Qur'an is a guidance for these people; and what an ideal guidance it is!! Then comes the special group which is perfect both in knowledge and deeds, ready to receive the light of divine guidance, and may be relied upon to discriminate between right and wrong. For such people, the Qur'an is the clear evidence and proof of guidance and discrimination. It leads them to the guidance and chooses right for them and shows them how to discriminate between good and evil, right and wrong. God says: *Whereby Allah guides him, who follows His pleasure, into the ways of peace and takes them out from darkness towards the light by His will and guides them unto the path that is straight* (5:16).

From the above discourse one may understand why God has used here two words "guidance" and "clear evidence of guidance." The relation between the two is that of general and particular. The Qur'an is guidance for one group and clear evidence of guidance for another.

… so whosoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast therein: *Shahādah* (witnessing,) means 'presence' by which one acquires knowledge. Witnessing the month means arrival of the month and the knowledge of its arrival.

Some people say that witnessing of the month means sighting of the new moon, and not on journey. But there is no evidence to support. this interpretation. Of course, sometimes the context implies such a meaning; but there is no such context in this verse.

… ***and whosoever is sick or on a journey [he shall fast] the same***

number of other days: This sentence has been repeated here. But this repetition is not for emphasis. It was explained earlier that the first two verses did not promulgate any law; rather they paved the way for such promulgation and prepared the minds to accept and follow the law which was to be shortly announced. It is in this third verse in which that law has been promulgated. As the aim of the first sentences is different from this one, there is, in fact, no repetition.

Allah desires ease for you and He desires not hardship for you; and so that you may complete the [prescribed] number: It is the explanation of the above mentioned exception. A sick person or a traveller has to break his fast because God desires ease for you, and he shall fast the same number in other days so that you may complete the prescribed number.

'So that' in *so that you may complete the number* (litukmil al-ʿiddah) gives the meaning of the cause, and it is governed by the verb "desires." Therefore, its meaning will be: We ordered you to break the fast (under certain conditions) and repay it in other days to lighten your burden and to complete the prescribed number.

… ***and that you glorify Allah for his guiding you, and so that you may be thankful to Him:*** Apparently, these two sentences, the first of which begins with 'so that' (*L …*) for a 'cause,' give the reason of the fast, and not of the exception and exemption. The words the month of Ramaḍān are followed by the description of the revelation of the Qur'an in this month. And it indicates that there is a connection between the promulgation of the fast of the month of Ramaḍān and the revelation of the Qur'an in it as a guidance for the people and a clear evidence of guidance and discrimination between right and wrong. Therefore, the 'so that' (*L…*) points out that keeping the fast is meant to glorify God because He revealed the Qur'an for them and announced His Lordship and the people's servitude. Also it is a thanks to Him since He guided them unto the truth and gave them a Book which discriminates for them between right and wrong.

There is a difference between thanking God by fasting and glorifying Him through it. A fast can be said to be a thanks to God only when it contains the real spirit of the fast. What is the real spirit of the fast? To be sincere towards God by purifying oneself from material involvement and abstaining from the greatest desires of the heart.

But glorifying Him does not depend on that real spirit. The form of the fast and mere abstaining from those things which break the fast (whether

it is done with sincere intention or not) shows the glory of God and His greatness, as the man is following His command with such self-denial.

Keeping in view this difference, God has differentiated between glorifying and thanking: Thanking has been prescribed with (*laʿalla*) which literally means 'perhaps' and is used to indicate hope, while glorifying has begun with 'so that' (*L…*) which indicates cause. And thus we find, *and that you glorify Allah…and so that you may be thankful to Him*. It is the same style which is used at the end of the first of these verses, *so that you may guard yourselves…*

Examining Narrations

(1) *al-Ḥadīth al-Qudsī*: God said, "The fast is for Me and I shall give its reward." (or, "I shall be its reward")

Explanation: This hadith has been narrated by both groups (that is, Sunni and Shia) with slight variations. Why has the fast been declared to be for God? Because it is the only act of worship which consists of a negative aspect only, for example, not eating, not drinking, and so on, while all other acts of worship, like prayer and pilgrimage, and so on, consist of positive actions or are made up of positive and negative aspects. The positive actions cannot be absolutely pure in showing the worshipper's spirit of servitude or the Lordship of Almighty God. It cannot be free of materialistic imperfections and limitations, and sometimes it may be done to please someone other than God (as in the case of hypocrisy and showing off). But the fast is an act of worship in which one has just to abstain from lust and desire and restrain oneself from worldly matters. This negative aspect is a thing which nobody can know except God. It is a dealing entirely between the servant and his Lord, and therefore this worship is purely for God; others can have no share in it.

"I shall give its reward" can also be translated "I shall be its reward." If the former, then it means that God Himself will give its reward directly and will not make anyone a link between Himself and His servant. The servant worshipped Him in a way that nobody knew but God, so he will be given its reward in a way that nobody will know it but God.

It is like the hadith about alms: "Verily alms, God takes it Himself without making anyone a link in it. God said, *Do they not know that Allah … takes the alms* (9:105).

If the second translation is correct, then it indicates that the reward

of the one who fasts is nearer to God.

(2) Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "The Messenger of God, in the early days of his prophethood, used to fast continuously so that people would think that he would not leave a single day's fast, and then to leave the fast continuously so that they would say he would not fast again. Then he changed this regime and began fasting on alternate days, and this was the fast of (Prophet) David. Then he changed it and started fasting three bright days (that is, 13th, 14th and 15th of the lunar month when the moonlight is the brightest.) Then again he divided the three days—one day each in every ten days, the first and last Thursdays and the Wednesday in the middle. And he continued with this regime till he left this world." (*al-Kāfī*)

(3) And there is a hadith from ʿAnbasah al-ʿĀbid that when the Messenger of God died it was his custom to fast in Shaʿbān and Ramaḍān and three days in every month.

Author's comment: There are numerous traditions about it from Ahl al-Bayt; and this is the sunnah fast which the Messenger of God used to keep in addition to the fast of Ramaḍān.

(4) There is a hadith in *Tafsīr* of al-ʿAyyāshī under the words of God, O ye who believe! Fasting has been prescribed for you, from Imam al-Ṣādiq that "It is for the believers only."

(5) Jamīl asked Imam al-Ṣādiq about the words of God, *O ye who believe! Fighting has been prescribed for you*, and *O ye who believe! Fasting has been prescribed on you*. The Imam replied: "All such verses cover (even) those who have gone astray as well as the hypocrites, and (in short) everyone who accepted the declared Call (that is, Islam)."

(6) Ḥafṣ said: "I heard Abū ʿAbdillāh say: 'Verily the month of Ramaḍān, God did not prescribe its fast for any of the people before us.' I asked: 'Then (what is the meaning of) the word of God: *O ye who believe! Fasting has been prescribed for you as it was prescribed for those before you?*' (The Imam) said: 'Verily God prescribed the month of Ramaḍān for the prophets, not for their peoples. Thus God honored this *ummah* and prescribed its fast for the Messenger of God as well as for this *ummah*.'" (*Man lā yaḥḍuruh al faqīh*)

Author's comment: This hadith is weak because there is Ismāʿīl b.

Muḥammad in its chain of narrators. The same thing is narrated from al-ᶜĀlim that is, Imam al-Kāẓim, and probably both traditions are one and the same. In any case, this is a solitary tradition[1]. The obvious meaning of the verses does not support the view that "as it was prescribed for those before you" refers to the prophets only. Had it been the case (and we know that this sentence has been revealed to encourage the believers to fast, to prepare them for it and to exhort them), then it would have served the purpose better if the word, 'prophets,' had been clearly mentioned, as it would have been more effective. And God knows better.

(7) There is a tradition from a man who asked Imam al-Ṣādiq whether the Qur'an and Furqān are two things or one. (The Imam) said: "Qur'an is the complete Book and Furqān is the obligatory law." (*al-Kāfī*)

(8) A hadith from the same Imam says: "Furqān is every clear verse of the Book." (*Jawāmiᶜu al- jāmiᶜ*)

(9) The same Imam said: "Furqān is every clear law in the Qur'an and the Book is the complete Qur'an which vouches for the previous prophets." (*al-Tafsīr*, al-ᶜAyyāshī and al-Qummī)

Author's comment: This interpretation is supported by the literal meaning of the word.

It has been said in some traditions that Ramaḍān is one of the names of God; therefore, one should not say 'Ramaḍān came' or 'Ramaḍān went away'; but should say 'the month of Ramaḍān …' But it is a solitary tradition and is unusual. This saying has been reported also from Qatādah from among the commentators of the Qur'an. But the traditions which count the names of God do not mention Ramaḍān as one of His names. And the use of the word Ramaḍān without the word "month" as well as its dual form "Ramaḍānān"(two Ramaḍāns) is very common in the traditions narrated from the Prophet and the imams of Ahl al-Bayt This usage is very common; and it cannot be said that a particular narrator might have omitted the word 'month' by mistake.

(10) al-Ṣabāḥ b. Nubātah said: "I told Abū ᶜAbdillāh that Ibn Abī Yaᶜfūr told me to ask you some questions. The Imam said: 'And what are those?' I said: 'He asks you, if the month of Ramaḍān enters and

1 *khabar al-wāḥid*—a tradition which is not narrated by a great enough number of narrators as to create a certainty of its truth.

one is in his house, is he allowed to go on a journey?' The Imam said: 'Verily God says so whosoever of you witnesses the month, he shall fast therein. Therefore, anyone who is in his house when the month of Ramaḍān enters is not allowed to travel except for hajj or ʿ*umrah* or in search of such goods which are in danger of being lost.' " (al-ʿAyyāshī)

Author's comment: It is a fine inference of a non-obligatory law based on the generality of the words.

(11) ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn said: "And as regards the fast of a journey and sickness, the Sunnis (ʿ*āmmah*) have conflicting views: a group says, he shall fast; others say, he shall not fast; still others opine, he will fast if he so wishes, and shall leave it if so desires. But we say, he shall leave the fast in both conditions. And if he fasted while on journey or during illness then on him is its repayment, that is, he must fast the same number on other days, because God says, But whoso among you be sick or on a journey, then (he shall fast) the sane number of other days." (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: al-ʿAyyāshī also has narrated this tradition.

(12) And there is in the same *Tafsīr* (under the words of God, *so whosoever of you witnesses the month …*) a tradition of Imam al-Bāqir in which the Imam said: How clear is this verse for him who understands—He who is present in Ramaḍān shall fast, and he who is on a journey during it shall break the fast.

Author's comment: There are numerous traditions of the imams of Ahl al-Bayt that it is incumbent on the sick and the traveller to break the fast; and the same is their *madhhab*. Also, you have seen that the verse of the Qur'an clearly proves the same.

(13) Abū Balīr said: "I asked him (the Imam) about the words of God, *and those who are hardly able to do so, on them is a redemption by feeding a poor man.* The Imam said: 'The aged man who is not able (to fast) and the sick.' " (al-ʿAyyāshī)

(14) Imam al-Baqīr is reported to have said about that verse: "The aged man, and the one who has a sickness in which he is always thirsty." (*ibid.*)

(15) Imam al-Ṣādiq is reported to have said in explanation of that verse: "The woman who is afraid for her child and the aged man." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: There are numerous traditions from the imams to this effect. And the "sick" mentioned in the tradition of Abū Basīr (mentioned above) means that sick person whose illness continues the whole year till the next Ramaḍān comes; such a sick person will not be required to fast the same number of other days.

(16) Saʿīd said that Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "Verily, there is *takbīr* (*Allāhu akbar*) on the day of *ʿId al-fiṭr*. I said: 'There is no *takbīr* except in *ʿId al-Aḍḥā*.' The Imam said: 'There is *takbīr* on that day; but it is *sunnah* in prayers of sunset, nightfall, dawn, noon and afternoon and in the two *rakʿats* of *ʿīd*.' " (al-ʿAyyāshī)

(17) Saʿīd al-Naqqāsh said: "Abū ʿAbdillāh told me, 'There is *takbīr* on the eve of *ʿId al-fiṭr* but it is *sunnah*. I asked him; 'And when it is?' He said: 'In the prayer of sunset, nightfall on the eve of *ʿId al-fiṭr* and in the prayers of dawn and *ʿīd*. Then it is discontinued.' I asked him: 'How should I say it?' He said: 'You say (*Allāhu akbar Allāhu akbar lāillāha illaʾllāhu waʾllāhu akbar Allāhu akbaru ʿalā mā hadānā*)—and it is the meaning of the words of God, so that you shall complete the number (that is, prayer) and that you glorify God for His guiding you. And the glorifying (*takbīr*) is that you say: (*Allāhu akbar, lā illāha illaʾllāh u waʾllāhu akbar wa lillāhi ʾl-ḥamd*).' And he said: 'In a tradition the last *takbīr* is four times.'" (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: The first tradition includes prayers of noon and afternoon in glorifying (*takbīr*) and the last one omits them. This difference may be an indication of the difference in the degrees of *sunnah*. And the word of the Imam, "that is, prayer," perhaps indicate that the words of God, so that you shall complete the number, means 'complete the number of the days of fast with the prayer of *ʿīd* and glorify God with prayers for His guiding you.' This meaning is not against the meaning which we described earlier because it is an inference of a non-obligatory rule from a sentence containing an obligatory law. It is like the tradition quoted earlier in which the Imam inferred from the verse, so whosoever of you witnesses the month he shall fast therein the undesirability of travel when one is in his abode on the first night.

The tradition has two different methods of *takbīr*. This difference supports the opinion of some writers that glorifying in "that you glorify God" includes praising also, and that is why it is followed in this verse

by the preposition 'on' (ʿ*alā*) which is the preposition generally used after praise (*al-ḥamd*).

(18) Ibn Abī ʿUmayr said that he asked Imam al-Ṣādiq: "May I be your ransom! Is it correct what we are told, that the Prophet fasted for twenty-nine days much more than he fasted for thirty days? He (the Imam) said: 'God did not create a single letter of this talk. The Prophet did not fast but thirty days, because God says: You shall complete the number. Was the Messenger of God shortening it?' " (al-ʿAyyāshī)

Author's comment: This question is for repudiation. The tradition shows what we have already mentioned that completing here means completing the month of Ramaḍān.

(19) One of our companions narrates about the words of God, *so that you glorify Allah for His guiding you*, that glorifying means 'extolling' and guidance means 'friendship of the imams' (*wilāyah*). (*al Maḥāsin*)

Author's comment: The interpretation of guidance as friendship of the Imam is like explaining an idea by giving a clear example. Also, it may be treated as its inner meaning. It is as has been mentioned in some traditions that in the verse: *God desires ease for you and He desires not hardship for you*, 'ease' means friendship (of the imams) and 'hardship' means their enmity and friendship with enemies of God.

(20) Ḥafṣ b. al-Ghiyāth asked Abū ʿAbdillāh about the words of God, *the month of Ramaḍān in which was sent down the Qur'an*, when (the fact is that) the Qur'an was sent down twenty years from its beginning to its end. Abū ʿAbdillāh said: "The Qur'an came all together in the month of Ramaḍān down to the 'Inhabited House'; then it came down (in segments) in a period of twenty years." Then the Imam said: "The Prophet said: 'The book of Abraham came down in the first night of the month of Ramaḍān, and the Torah was sent down on the sixth of the month of Ramaḍān, and the Zabūr (Psalms) was sent down on the eighteenth of the month of Ramaḍān and the Qur'an was sent down on the twenty-third of the month of Ramaḍān.' " (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: The tradition of the Prophet narrated by the Imam has been narrated by al-Suyūṭī in *al-Durr al-manthūr*, with several chains from the Prophet through Wāthilah b. al-Asqaʿ.

(21) Yaʿqūb said; "I heard a man asking Abū ʿAbdillāh about the Night of Destiny, whether it occurred (once only) or it comes every year. Abū ʿAbdillāh said: 'If the Night of Destiny were taken away the Qur'an would be taken away.' " (*al-Kāfī* and *Man lā yaḥḍurruh al faqīh*)

(22) Ibn ʿAbbās said: "The month of Ramaḍān and the Blessed Night and the Night of Destiny; because verily the Night of Destiny is the Blessed Night and it is in Ramaḍān. The Qur'an came down all together from reminder (*dhikr*) to the 'Inhabited House' and it is the falling place of the stars in the lowest heaven where the Qur'an came down. Later it descended on Muḥammad piecemeal, about order, prohibition, and in battles.' " (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: This matter has also been narrated by others, like Saʿīd b. Jubayr. And it appears from this talk of Ibn ʿAbbās that he inferred it from the Qur'anic verses; for example the words of God: *and the wise reminder* (3:58), *And [I swear by] the Book written in an outstretched fine parchment and the Inhabited House and the elevated canopy* (52:2-5); *But nay! I swear by the falling of stars, and most certainly it is a great oath if you only know, most surely it is an honored Qur'an in a Book that is hidden; none shall touch it save the purified ones* (56:75-79); *and We adorned the lowest heaven with lamps* (stars) *and [made it] to guard* (41:12) And all His words are clear except what He said about the place of falling, that it is the lowest heaven and is the place of the Qur'an. The meaning of this assertion is obscure and the verses of the 56th Chapter do not clearly show it. Of course, it is narrated from Ahl al-Bayt that the Inhabited House is in heaven, and we shall explain it, God willing, in its proper place.

What should clearly be understood is that traditions are like the Qur'an, because there are, in traditions also, some clear ones and others ambiguous. One very commonly finds in their talks which are based on hints and symbols, and especially so in the explanation of such facts as the Tablet, the Pen, the Curtain, the Heaven, the Inhabited House, the Swollen Sea and so on. Therefore, it is obligatory for a research scholar to strive his utmost to find out if there is any hint or context to determine the true meaning of a given text.

almizan.org

Verse 186

وَإِذَا سَأَلَكَ عِبَادِي عَنِّي فَإِنِّي قَرِيبٌ ۖ أُجِيبُ دَعْوَةَ الدَّاعِ إِذَا دَعَانِ ۖ فَلْيَسْتَجِيبُوا لِي وَلْيُؤْمِنُوا بِي لَعَلَّهُمْ يَرْشُدُونَ ﴿١٨٦﴾

(2:186) ***And when My servants ask you concerning Me, then verily I am near, I answer the prayer of the supplicant when he calls on Me, so they should answer My call and believe in Me, so that they may walk in the right way.***

Commentary

And when My servants ask you concerning Me, then verily I am near, I answer the prayer of the supplicant when he calls on Me: This is the best expression of the subject matter in the most elegant and beautiful style. The whole verse is based on the first person singular pronoun which shows the great importance which the speaker, that is, God attaches to this subject; then come the words *My servants* and not "people" or such other words; and this enhances its importance even more; the reply (*then verily I am near*) starts dramatically just after the question without any preamble like: "then say that I am near"; and the reply has been emphasized with "verily" (*inna*); and the nearness of the speaker is described with the adjective near and not with any verb like "I come near him," thus it shows that He is already near and will always remain near; then it mentions answering the prayer with the verb, the *muḍāriʿ* (aorist tense) which combines both the present and the future tenses; and indicates that He answers at present and will continue to answer the prayers of the supplicant; then the answer (*I answer the prayer of the supplicant*) is conditioned with *when he calls on Me*, but in reality it is not a condition separate from the main clause, both are one and the same thing, and it serves to emphasize that the prayer of the supplicant is answered without any condition or stipulation (as we see also in the verse: *call on Me, I will answer you* 40:60). These seven points show how much importance has been attached to the answering of prayers. In addition, this verse—short

as it is—repeats the first person singular pronoun seven times; it is the only verse with this characteristic in the whole of Qur'an.

Duʿāʾ and *daʿwah* (call) mean to turn the attention of the called one to the caller. Asking (*suʾāl*) means to gain a benefit or advantage from the one whose attention is drawn towards the asker and before whom his (asker's) need is put. Therefore, asking (*suʾāl*) is the final aim of calling (*duʿāʾ*). This meaning covers all types of asking, for example, asking for the removal of ignorance, asking with the meaning of reckoning, asking in the sense of seeking beneficence.

Literally, "bondage" (*ʿubūdiyyah*), as explained earlier, is the status of being owned. It is not used for any other owned thing except human beings. Therefore, "servant" (*ʿabd*) is used only for a human being or another intelligent being (like an angel).

The ownership of God is as different from the ownership of others as is the truth from pretence or the reality from metaphor. God owns His servants; His ownership is total and comprehensive. They have no authority, independent from God, over their own selves or over matters or things which are subordinate to them; for example, their attributes and actions and all things which are related to them, like wives, children, property, honor and so on. Everything which they own and is related to them in any way—as we say, his self, his body, his ears, his eyes, his actions, his impression (and these are a sort of natural and real possessions), or as we say, his spouse, his wealth, his honor, his right—(and these are a sort of supposed or assumed possession)—is in his possession only because God allowed the establishment of that relation of ownership between man and his possession, whatever it may be. It is God, glorified be His name, who gave their selves and their persons to them—and if He did not wish so, it could not be attributed to them and they would have remained without any self or person—in other words, non-existent. It is He who gave them hearing and sight and hearts; and it is He who created everything, then fixed for it a measure.

Therefore, God intervenes between a thing and its self, between it and between all its associates like child, spouse, friend, property, honor and rights. It means that He is the nearest of all to His creatures. In other words, He is the Near One in the true sense of this word. He has said: *And We are nearer to him than you, but you see [Us] not* (56:85); *and We are nearer to him than his life vein* (50:16); *and know that Allah intervenes*

between man and his heart (8:24). 'Heart' here means the rational soul or spirit.

In short, God's ownership of His creatures is real ownership, and as they are His servants. He is near to them in its true sense, which means nearest of all things. This ownership gives Him authority to make use of them as He wishes, without any hindrance or obstruction. Also it gives Him authority to answer any prayer which is put before Him by any of His creatures, and to fulfil his need by accepting his supplication, because the ownership is all encompassing, and His Power and pervasiveness cover all possible situations. It is not as though He has authority in one eventuality and not in the other, as the Jews say that when God created things and decreed their destinies, His work was finished and now His hands are folded up, He can not take any new decision; there is no abrogation (of previous laws), no change and no answering of prayer because every affair is already finished. Nor is it, as a group of this *ummah* said, that God has no power about the actions of His creatures. They are called Qadariyyah and were named the Magians of this *ummah* by the Messenger of God. Sunnis and Shias both have reported that the Messenger of God said: "Qadariyyah are the Magians of this *ummah*."

The truth is that real ownership in its totality is by God only and nobody owns any thing but when He makes him its owner and allows him to possess it. Therefore, whatever God wills and gives in possession and allows its coming into being, comes into being. And whatever He does not will, and does not give in possession and does not allow, does not come into being, even if one strives his utmost to bring it into being. God has said: *O people! You are they who are needy unto Allah, and Allah is He who is the Self-sufficient, the Most Praised One* (35:15).

It is, thus, clear that this verse not only mentions a fact, that is, answering prayer, but gives its reasons also: Because the supplicants are servants of God, He is near to them; and because He is near to them, He answers their prayers without any reservation. And the unconditional answering of prayer means that there is no condition imposed on prayer also; whatever prayer is addressed to Him, He shall answer it. Of course, it seems that His promise 'I answer the prayer of the supplicant' depends on the condition, when he calls Me. But this condition is not something different from the main clause; and such a mode of expression indicates that the main clause is free from metaphor and analogy; that its meaning is

what appears from the words. For example, when we say, "Listen to the sincere advisor when he sincerely advises you," or "Respect the scholar if he be a scholar," it means that we want him to be sure that the advisor is really sincere or the scholar is really a scholar so that listening to him or respecting him becomes necessary. In the same way, the condition *when he calls on Me* shows that the promise of answering the prayer shall apply when the supplicant is a supplicant in reality; when he wants that thing according to his natural and deep ingrained knowledge and when his heart is really in what his tongue is asking for. The reality of prayer and supplication is what the heart decries and the tongue of nature asks for, not this tongue of flesh which moves as it is moved without caring whether the word spoken is a truth or a lie, a reality or a metaphor, a serious talk or a joke. It is because of this that God has even mentioned such prayers in which the tongue is not used at all. He said: *And He gave you of all that you asked Him; and if you count Allah's bounties, you will not be able to compute them; Verily, man is very unjust very ungrateful* (14:34). Mankind prays to Him and beseeches Him for bounties which they cannot count, but this asking is not done by the tongue of the mouth, it is done by the tongue of their neediness, the tongue of nature and existence. Also He said: *All those in the heavens and the earth do beseech Him; every day He is in a [new] splendor* (55:29). This verse more clearly proves what we have just said.

Therefore, the natural prayer addressed to God shall always be answered. If a prayer is not answered then it lacks both or one of the two things mentioned in the verse: *the prayer of the supplicant when he calls on Me*. It may happen in following ways:

First: There may be no prayer at all, it may only be a misunderstanding of the supplicant. For example, a man prays for an impossible thing (but he does not know that it is impossible), or for a thing which, if he knew the fact, would not have wanted at all. Let us say that someone was sick and died but his friend is unaware of his death and prays for his recovery, while now the prayer should be for bringing him back to life. If he had been really sure that a dead body could be resurrected and had asked for its resurrection (as the prophets did) his life would have been returned to him; but he does not have such firm conviction and therefore the prayer is not answered. Or, let us say, he asks for a thing which, had he known it really, he would not have wanted. Therefore, it is not granted.

Second: There is indeed a prayer, but it is not addressed exclusively to God. For example, a man beseeches God for his needs, but his heart is looking towards its apparent causes or to some imaginary beings whom he thinks have power to fulfil his needs. In this case, his prayer is not addressed exclusively to God. In other words, he did not beseech God at all; because God, Who answers the prayers, is the One who has no partner in His affairs. He is not the one who works in partnership with apparent causes and imaginary beings.

So these are the two groups of supplicants whose hearts were not sincere in their prayers even if their tongues were.

This is the gist of the subject of prayer according to the verse of the Qur'an. The meaning of all verses on this subject may be understood from this explanation. See, for example, the following verses: *Say, my Lord would not care for you, were it not for your prayer; but you have indeed rejected [the truth], so soon you shall be in the grip* (25:77); *Say, think you that if the chastisement of Allah comes to you or the Hour comes to you, will you call upon other than Allah, if you are truthful[Nay! Him you will call upon, so He clears away that for which you pray, if He pleases, and you will forget what you set up [with Him]* (6:40-41); *Say, who is it that delivers you from the [dread of the] darkness of the land and the sea [when] you pray to him [openly] humiliating yourselves and secretly: If He delivers us from this, certainly we shall be of the grateful ones. Say, Allah delivers you from them and from every distress, yet again you associate [others] with Him* (6:63-64).

These verses prove that man has been created with a natural prayer and inborn request, which is silently addressed to his Lord. But when he spends his life in ease and prosperity, his soul becomes blinded by apparent causes and he treats them as partners to his Lord; thus he becomes confused and thinks that he does not ask his Lord for anything and does not beseech Him, while the fact is that he does not beseech anyone other than God, because this prayer (to God) is ingrained into his nature, and there is no change in the creation of God. Later comes the hardship and the apparent causes become divorced from the expected effects, and those whom he treated as partners of God or intercessors before Him disappear completely; then he realizes that there is no one to fulfil his needs and to answer his prayers except God. Thus, he returns to his natural monotheism and forgets every other cause and turns his face towards the Beneficent Lord; and the Lord clears away his hardship and fulfils his wants and places

him under the shade of opulence. But as soon as he regains his prosperity and happiness he goes back to the previous polytheism and forgetfulness.

And your Lord said: Call upon Me, I will answer you. Verily, those who are arrogant to My worship shall soon enter Hell, disgraced (40:60).

This verse invites mankind to beseech God, and promises the answering, and goes even further by naming the prayer as worship in the clause, *arrogant to My worship* which means "to my prayer." Rather, it equates the worship with prayer: it threatens with Hell those who do not pray, and such a threat can only be justified when one neglects worship completely, not on neglecting only one kind of it. Therefore, the prayer is not just an important type of worship; it is the foundation of worship itself.

From the above, one may appreciate the meaning of other verses on this subject: *Therefore, call upon Allah, being sincere to Him in religion, though averse be the disbelievers* (40:14); *And call on Him fearing and hoping; surely, the mercy of Allah is near to those who do good* (7:56); *… surely they used to … call unto Us with love and reverence, and were humble before Us* (21:90); *Call upon your Lord humbly and secretly; surely He loves not those who exceed the limit* (7:55); *When called he* (Zachariah) *unto his Lord in low voice. He said: My Lord! Surely my bones are weakened and my head flares with hoariness, and, my Lord! Never have I been unsuccessful in my prayer to Thee* (19:3-4); *And He answers those who believe and do good deeds, and increases unto them of His grace* (42:26).

There are other relevant verses, and all of these contain the pillars of prayer and explain the manner of the supplication. And the most important of all is to keep the prayer exclusively for God; it will come true when the feeling of the heart conforms with the words spoken by the tongue; when one abandons reliance on all apparent reasons other than God and depends exclusively upon God. Also among them are: fear of God; hope in His answering; His love and reverence; humility and humbleness; as well as perseverance in prayer; remembrance of God; good deeds; true faith; presence of heart at that time; and similar things.

So they should answer My call and believe in Me: This sentence branches out from the previous one. God is near to His servants; nothings comes between Him and their prayer; He cares for them and for the things they ask for; that is why He invites them to call upon Him and He is of such high attributes. Therefore, they should accept this invitation of their Lord and should advance towards Him, and have faith in Him about

this attribute, having firm belief that He is near and He answers their call; so that they may be guided rightly in praying unto Him.

Examining Narrations

(1) The Sunnis and Shias both have narrated from the Prophet that "Prayer is the armament of the believer."

(2) It is narrated in *al-Ḥadīth al-qudsī*: "O Moses! Ask from Me all that you need, even fodder for your goat and salt for your dough." (*ʿUddatu al-dāʿī*)

(3) The Prophet said: "Calling (upon God) is better than reciting the Qur'an, because God (Powerful and Great is He!) said, 'Say, My Lord would not care for you were it not for your prayer.'" (*Makārim al-akhlāq*)

Author's comment: The same hadith has been narrated from Imam al-Bāqir and Imam al-Ṣādiq.

(4) Muḥammad b. ʿAjlān narrates from Muḥammad b. ʿUbaydullāh b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn from his cousin, Imam al-Ṣādiq from his forefathers from the Prophet that he said: "God informed one of his prophets in a revelation: 'By My Power and Dignity! Verily I shall change into despair the hope of everyone who hoped from other than Me, and I shall dress him with the clothing of disgrace before people, and I shall remove him from My relief and bounty. Does my servant put his hope in other than Me in hardships, while hardships are in My hand; And does he expect anything from other than Me, while I am the Self-sufficient, the Munificent? In My hand are the keys of the doors, while they are closed; and My door is open for the one who calls on Me . ..' " (*ʿUddatu al-dāʿī*)

(5) The Prophet said: "God said; 'No creature seeks refuge in another creature, leaving Me, but that I cut off all the means in the heavens and the earth for him. Then if he asks from Me, I do not give him; and if he calls on Me, I do not answer him. And no creature seeks refuge in Me, leaving My creatures, but that I make the heaven and the earth responsible for his sustenance; then if he calls on Me, I answer him and, if he seeks pardon from Me, I forgive!' " (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: The aim of the above two traditions is to emphasize that the invocation must be purely for God. It was not meant to negate the positive causes which God has created as instrumental links

between the things and their needs. But these instruments are not independent causes. The Independent Cause is only God. And man does have an inner feeling of this fact: he feels by his nature that there is a Perfect Cause who fulfils his needs and who can never fail in bringing about the desired effect. On the other hand, he knows that all the apparent causes which are expected to produce an effect, some times fail to do so. Thus he knows that the First Cause, who is the Source and Origin of everything and upon whom every need relies and depends for its fulfilment, is other than these apparent causes. Once he realizes it, he will never entirely rely on these causes, forgetting the Real Cause. Man may appreciate this fact after just a little thinking.

Now, if he prays for something and that need is fulfilled, it will prove that he asked his Lord for it, and that the prayer, which emanated from his inner feeling and knowledge, reached through the apparent causes to His Lord and was granted by Him. On the contrary, if he prays to some apparent causes for it, then it does not originate from natural inner feeling and knowledge; it is just an imaginary need, based not on inner feeling but on some imaginary reasons. It is one of the situations where appearance goes against reality, because he thinks that he is praying, while his inner self knows nothing about that prayer.

Another example: Many a time that a man likes a thing and makes all efforts to get it; but when he gets it, he finds that it is harmful to another thing which is far more important and far more dear than that thing. Then he leaves that which he had strived for and keeps that which is more important. Likewise, sometimes he dislikes a thing, but once it comes to him he finds it far more beneficial and far better than the alternative which he previously preferred. A child is sick; when he is given a bitter medicine, he refuses to take it and starts crying. But at the same time he wants to regain his health. Now the position is this: his natural inner feeling prays for health and, therefore, for the medicine; but his words and deeds reject the same medicine. Likewise, man, in his life, has a discipline based on natural understanding and inner feeling; and he also has a system based on his imagination only. The natural discipline makes no mistake, it never leads astray; while the imaginary discipline often goes wrong. It is clear from the example of the sick child that sometimes man asks for some thing urged by his imagination but in reality that very prayer is the prayer for its opposite.

This discourse will help the readers in understanding the meaning of the traditions, and it is also the implication of the words of ʿAlī which come later, "Verily, the granting (of Prayer) is according to the measure of the intention …"

(6) The Prophet said: "Call upon God and you can be confident for the answering." (*ʿUddatu al-dāʿī*)

(7) "I am near the opinion (that is, expectation) of My servant about Me; so, he should not have any opinion about Me (that is, should not expect from Me) except good." (*al-Ḥadīth al-qudsī*)

Author's comment: It is because if one prays and at the same time is pessimistic or doubtful about its outcome, then it shows that the prayer is just a formality, the supplicant has no real intention of asking for it (see the previous explanation). And the traditions forbid asking for a thing which one is sure will not come about.

(8) The Prophet said: "Resort to God in your needs; and seek refuge in Him in your misfortunes; and humiliate yourselves before Him and beseech Him, because, verily, supplication is the essence of worship. And no believer calls upon God but He answers him: either it is speeded up to him in this world, or is kept in reserve for him for the next one, or his sins are forgiven in proportion to his supplication, provided he does not pray for a sinful thing." (*ʿUddatu al-dāʿī*)

(9) Imam ʿAlī wrote in his will for his son, al-Ḥusayn: "Then He placed the keys of His treasures in your hands in the sense that He allowed you to ask Him. Therefore, whenever you wish, you may get the doors of His bounties opened with prayer, and get the heavy rains of His Mercy to fall upon you. Delay in acceptance of the prayer should not disappoint you, because the granting (of prayer) is according to the measure of (your) intention. And sometimes, the answering of your prayer is delayed so that it brings a greater reward to the one asking and a better granting to the expectant. Sometimes you ask for a thing and it is not given to you, but a better thing is given to you, immediately or later; or a thing is diverted from you for some greater good for you, because often you ask for a thing which would have destroyed your religion had it been given to you. Therefore, your prayer should be for things whose beauty should last for you and whose

evil should remain away from you. As for wealth, it will not last for you, nor will you last for it." (*Nahj al-balāghah*)

Author's comment: "The granting (of prayer) is according to the measure of (your) intention." Imam ʿAlī implies that the answer is given according to the call. The supplicant is granted whatever he asks for from God with the firm conviction of his conscience and with his heart, and not what is asked for in words. As explained earlier, the words sometimes do not completely conform with the real requirement demanded by the nature. This sentence, therefore, shows in the most lucid and comprehensive way, the relationship between prayer and its answer. Imam ʿAlī has, in this writing, explained many cases in which it appears that the prayer was not granted, for example where there is delay in answering the call, or a material bounty is asked for but it is changed to some thing which is far better for him either in this world or in the next, or it is diverted to some thing more beneficial for the asker. The supplicant had, for example, asked for a pleasant bounty; and if he were given it without delay it would not have been really appreciated and valued, and, therefore, its granting was delayed. In short, when he asked for a "pleasant" bounty, he implicitly asked for a delay in granting of the prayer. Likewise, a believer who seriously pays attention to his religion, prays for some thing which would be harmful to his religion, although he does not know it and thinks that it would bring him happiness. But his happiness is in his religion and in the next world. Therefore, his prayer is in fact for the next world, not for this one, and, accordingly, it is granted for the next world, not for this one.

(10) Imam al-Bāqir said: "A servant does not extend his hand towards God, but that God is ashamed to return it empty. He puts in it from His bounty and mercy whatever He wishes. So, when one of you calls (upon God), he should not return his hand until he wipes it on his head and face." (*ʿUddatu al-dāʿī*)

In another hadith it is "on his face and chest."

Author's comment: There are in *al-Durr al-manthūr* eight similar traditions narrated by a number of the companions, like Salmān, Jābir, ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar, Anas b. Mālik and Ibn Abī Mughīth from the Prophet; and all of them mention raising of the hands in the prayer. Therefore, it is meaningless to reject raising of hands in the prayer as someone has done saying that "it is suggestive of the belief that God has a body, because the raising of the hands towards the sky is an indication that He is there - Holy

and Sanctified is He from it."

But this statement is wrong. All acts of worship performed by the body are in reality the heartfelt sense of gratitude and inner attention which is reduced to the level of symbolic appearance; and the spiritual realities are demonstrated in the moulds of the body, as one may see in the *ṣalāt*, the fast, the hajj, and so on, and their parts. and conditions. Had it not been so, there would not have been any justification for worship by the body. And invocation is such a form of worship. It is the attention of the heart and the inner supplication demonstrated by the symbol of the begging of a wretched pauper coming near a powerful and wealthy person, raising and extending his hands towards him and asking his needs from him, humiliating himself before him and imploring him to grant him his requirements. ash-Shaykh has reported in *al Majālis wa al-akhbār*, with his *sanad* (chain of narrators) from Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Zayd from their father, Imam ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn from his father al-Ḥusayn from the Prophet that "The Messenger of God used to raise his hands when he prayed and beseeched (God) as a pauper begs for food." The same hadith is written in *ʿUddatu al-dāʿī* without *sanad*.

(11) Imam ʿAlī heard a man saying "O God! I seek refuge in Thee from temptation." ʿAlī said: "I see, you are seeking refuge against your wealth and children. God says: *Verily your wealth and your children are temptations* (8:28). You should rather say: O God! I seek refuge in Thee from misleading temptations." (*Biḥār al-anwār*)

Author's comment: It is another way of determining the meaning of a word. And there are many such examples in traditions. The fact is that the true meaning of every word is that for which it has been used by God in His talk. And some examples of this are the traditions which explain the meaning of 'part,' 'many' and so on.

(12) Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "Verily, God does not answer the memorised prayer by a forgetful heart." (*ʿUddatu al-dāʿī*)

(13) Imam ʿAlī said: "God does not accept the prayer of an inattentive heart." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: There are other traditions with this meaning; and the reason is that there is in reality no prayer and supplication with forgetfulness and inattention.

(14) There is in the Torah: God says to His servant, "Verily, when you pray against one of my servants because he was unjust to you,

then at the same time there may be another of my servants praying against you too because you were unjust to him. Now, if you so wish, I shall grant your prayer and also his prayer against you; and if you so wish, I shall postpone the cases of both of you for the Day of Resurrection." (al-Rāwandī, *al-Daʿwāt*)

Author's comment: If someone prays for something then it means that he is pleased with it and this pleasure naturally extends to all those things which are similar to it in all respects. He prays for punishment of his oppressor; he prays against him because of his oppression and injustice. It means that he is pleased with the punishment of the unjust. Now, if he himself oppressed another person then the same prayer against his oppressor shall become a prayer against himself. If he is pleased that he himself should be punished (and he shall never be pleased with it), then he will be given the same punishment which he wanted for his oppressor. And if he is not pleased with it, then there is in reality no prayer at all. God said: *And man prays for evil as he aught to pray for good, and man is ever hasty* (17:11).

(15) The Messenger of God said to Abū Dharr: "O Abū Dharr! Should I not teach you some words by which God will benefit you? I (Abū Dharr) said: 'Surely! O Messenger of God.' He said: 'Guard (the commands of) God, (and) God will guard you. Keep (the remembrance of) God, (and) you will find Him before you. Make the acquaintance of God in opulence, He will know you in hardship. And when you ask, ask from God; and when you seek help, seek help from God, because whatever is to happen up to the Day of Resurrection has already been written, and if all the creatures together strived to benefit you with what God did not write for you, they would not be able to do so.' " (*ʿUddatu al-dāʿī*)

Author's comment: His words, "Make the acquaintance of God in opulence, He will know you in hardship," mean "Call upon God in opulence and do not forget Him, so that He will answer your call in hardship and will not forget you." Anybody who forgets his Lord in opulence is as if he believes that the apparent causes are the total and real cause of his opulence. Then comes the hardship and he starts calling on his Lord. His action indicates that he believes in the Lordship of God only when he is afflicted with hardship. But God is not so. He is the Lord in every condition and every situation. Therefore, if he calls on a lord whose lordship

is limited to the time of hardship only, he does not call on the True Lord.

This meaning has been explained in some traditions in a different language:

(16) Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "One who goes on calling (on his Lord) in advance, his call will be answered when there comes down an affliction (on him), and it will be said,'(it is) a known voice,' and it will not be screened out of the heavens. And the one who does not call (on his Lord) in advance, his call is not answered when an affliction comes, and the angels say, 'It is a voice which we do not know…' " (*Makārim al-akhlāq*)

And it is understood from the word of God, *They forget Allah, so He forgets them* (9:68). There is another tradition that *duʿāʾ* (prayer) is not rejected if one cuts oneself (from all apparent causes and turns exclusively towards God). There is no contradiction between this tradition and those mentioned before, because affliction and hardship is something different from exclusively turning towards God.

His words: and when you ask, ask from God, and when you seek help, seek help from God. It teaches one to adhere only to God in reality while asking and seeking help; because so far as these nominal causes, which we find in this world are concerned, their relation with their effects is confined within the limit set for it by God. They are not independent in producing the effect as it appears to uninformed eyes; they are only a means to produce that effect; the incumbent on the man to turn towards God in all his needs, without relying on nominal causes and means, although God has decreed not to produce an effect if its cause is missing. In short, the above sentence tells one not to rely on nominal causes and not to forget that it is God who has made it a cause of that effect. It does not mean that one should neglect the causes and means and ask for one's needs without striving for its cause; it would be rather asking for the impossible. One should realize that even the heart where the prayer originates, the tongue which utters the words of the prayer and the hands, and so on, which are used in praying are but some of the causes and means. So, how can one escape from the apparent causes?

Let us look at the example of man himself. Whatever he does, is done with his limbs and organs: he gives with his hands, sees with his eyes and hears with his ears. Now, if one asked his Lord to fulfil his needs neglecting its causes and means, it would be as if he asked someone to give him

something without using his hand, or to look at him without using his eyes or to listen to his pleas without using his ears.

On the other hand, if one relies on the nominal causes without remembering God, it would be as though one thinks that it is the man's hand which gives, his eyes which see and his ears which hear, and forgets that the real doer of these actions is man himself. Such a person is stupid and a simpleton.

The above explanation does not mean that the Power of God is limited, or that His Authority is conditional. No, His Power and Authority are All-encompassing and without limit. In the same way the limitations are meant to apply to the deeds not to doers. Obviously, it is man who has the power to give, see and hear, though he gives with his hand, sees with his eyes and hears with his ears. Likewise, God is All-powerful, but the specification depends on intermediate causes. Zayd is a creation of God, and he was born through the union of his parents in a certain place on a certain day when certain conditions were fulfilled and certain obstacles removed. Now, if even one of these causes be missing and one of these conditions be not fulfilled, there would be no Zayd. Thus the existence of Zayd depends on the fulfilment of all these causes and means; but what depends is the creature, that is, Zayd, not the Creator. (Think on this point.)

His words: Whatever is to happen up to the Day of Resurrection has already been written. It is based on the sentence, And when you ask, ask from God, and gives its reason. It means that all events are written and decreed by God; no cause has any real influence on them; therefore, you should not ask from anyone other than God, and should not seek any one's help other than that of God. As for God, His authority is everlasting; His Power is Eternal; His Will is effective; and every day He is in a new Splendor. It is for this reason that this sentence is followed by the words: and if all the creatures together strived to benefit you with what God did not write for you, they would not be able to do so.

(17) Among the traditions of *duʿāʾ* is the near *mutawātir* hadith: "Verily, *duʿāʾ* (prayer) is a part of destiny."

Author's comment: This is the reply to the objection of the Jews and others on *duʿāʾ*. They say: The need asked for is either already measured and decreed (to happen) or not. If it is already decreed, then it would happen in any case and the prayer would be superfluous. If it is not decreed,

then it can never happen and the prayer would be meaningless. In either case, the prayer will have no effect at all.

The reply: Even when an event is already decreed, it does not mean that it is independent of its causes, and one of the means of its coming into existence is *duʿāʾ*. If one beseeches God for his need, one of the conditions of its existence is fulfilled; and the effect follows the cause. This is the meaning of the tradition, "Verily, *duʿāʾ* (prayer) is a part of destiny."

(18) And there are other traditions with the same meaning. There is a hadith from the Prophet: "Nothing turns away the decree (fate) except prayer (*duʿāʾ*)." (*Biḥār al-anwār*). And there is another one from Imam al-Ṣādiq: "Prayer (*duʿāʾ*) turns away the decree even after it is confirmed." (*ibid.*) Another one from Imam Musa al-Kāẓim: "On you is *duʿāʾ*, because *duʿāʾ* and asking from God turns the calamity away even when it is measured and decreed and nothing remains except its enforcement; then if God is called upon and asked, He removes that calamity entirely." (*ibid.*)

(19) Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "Verily, the prayer (*duʿāʾ*) turns away the confirmed decree even after its confirmation. Therefore, pray often (and repeatedly), because it is the key to every mercy and the fulfilment of every need. And what is with God is not obtained except through prayer; because verily, no door is knocked repeatedly but it is hoped that it will be opened to the knocker." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: This hadith exhorts one to pray often and repeatedly; and this is one of the important elements of prayer, as repeated remembrance of a need creates purity of intention.

(20) Ismāʿīl b. Hammām narrates from Abu al-Ḥasan: "One secret prayer of a servant is equal to seventy open prayers."

Author's comment: This teaches one to keep one's prayer (*duʿāʾ*) secret and confidential because it helps in keeping the prayer pure.

(21) Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "The prayer is kept screened (that is, is not granted) until he (the one who beseeches) prays for the blessings of God upon Muḥammad and his progeny." (*Makārim al-akhlāq*)

(22) Also, Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "Whoever advances (the names of) forty believers (in his prayers) then prays (for himself), his call will be answered." (*ibid.*)

(23) One of the companions of Imam al-Ṣādiq said to him: "There are two verses in the Book of God (the application) for which I

am seeking without finding it." The Imam asked: "And what are those?" The companion says: "I said, '(there is the verse): *Call upon Me, I shall answer* … but we call upon Him and do not get any answer.' The Imam said: 'Well, do you think God has broken His promise?' I said: 'No!' He said: 'Then what?' I said: 'I do not know.' He said: 'But I will tell you. Whoever obeys God in His commandments, and then calls upon Him in the proper way, He will answer him.' I said: 'And what is the proper way of prayer (*duʿāʾ*)?' He said: 'You shall begin with the praise of God and shall glorify Him and remember His bounties upon you and thank Him; then you shall pray for His blessings upon Muḥammad and his progeny; then you shall remember your sins and confess them; then you shall seek (His) pardon for them. So this is the proper way of prayer (*duʿāʾ*).' Then the Imam asked: 'And what is the second verse?' I said: '*and whatever thing you spend, He returns it* (34:39), and I find that I spend but He does not return it.' He said: 'Well, do you think God has broken His promise?' I said: 'No!' He said: 'Then what?' I said: 'I do not know.' He said: 'If any of you earn his wealth lawfully and spend it in its proper place, he will not spend a single dirham but that God shall return it to him!' " (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: The reason of the manners of prayer (*duʿāʾ*) mentioned in these traditions is clear, because these things bring the servant (of God) nearer to the reality of prayer and request.

(24) Ibn ʾUmar reported that the Messenger of God said: "Verily, when God wishes to answer (the call of) a servant, He allows him to call (upon Him)." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(25) Also, Ibn ʿUmar narrates from him (the Holy Prophet):"Whenever the door of prayer (*duʿāʾ*) is opened for anyone among you, the doors of Mercy are opened for him." Another tradition says: "When the (door of) prayer is opened for anyone among you, the doors of the Garden (Paradise) are opened for him." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: The same thing has been narrated from the imams of Ahl al-Bayt also: "Whoever is given *duʿāʾ*, is given (its) answer." Its meaning is clear.

(26) Also there is a tradition from Maʿādh b. Jabal from the Messenger of God: "Had you known God, as He should be known, verily

the mountains would have been moved by your prayer." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: If a man does not know the dignity of the Creator and the power of His Lordship, and if he relies upon the causes, then he believes that these causes have real influence upon the result, and that events cannot happen without their normal and apparent causes. Sometimes he does not believe that these causes have any real effect upon the outcome, still he thinks that they are essential in order to bring a thing into existence. For example, we see that movement and walking brings one nearer to one's destination. And even when we do not believe that movement has any real effect on the nearness, we go on believing that movement is a means, though it is God who is the real cause, of that nearness, and in this way we go on believing that the middle causes are essential, at least as a means, if not as the real cause. Thus, we think that if there is no movement, we cannot come near our destination. In short, we believe that the effect cannot be separate from its causes, even if these causes are just apparent means and not the real cause.

But such a belief is below the dignity of God; it does not conform with divine authority which is total and perfect. It is this belief which creates the idea that effects cannot come into being without their normal causes, for example a body cannot be without a weight and gravity; movement is necessary for bringing two things nearer; eating and drinking is essential for satisfying the hunger and thirst, and so on. We have already mentioned in the discussion of miracles that the system of cause and effect is an inescapable fact; but it does not mean that the 'cause' is confined to the normal causes only. Reason as well as the Qur'an and the traditions prove that while everything depends upon a cause, that cause is not confined within the limits of normal ones. The Creator may create causes for it, quite different from the normal ones. So, while it is true that the effect depends upon a cause, it is not true that it depends upon a particular cause.

Of course, the things which are, according to reason, impossible, cannot come into being.

In short, when you properly know God, you will believe that the prayer for what is not impossible by reason, even if normally it does not happen, will be answered. A major portion of the miracles of the prophets was basically the answer to their calls.

(27) There is in the *al-Tafsīr* of al-ʿAyyāshī regarding the words of God, *So they should answer My call and believe in Me*, a hadith

from Imam al-Ṣādiq: "They should know that I have power to give them whatever they ask from Me."

(28) And there is another hadith in *Majmaᶜ al-bayān* from the same Imam that he said: "and believe in Me means that they should have firm belief that I have power to give them what they ask for; so that they may walk in the right way means so that they may reach the Truth."

almizan.org

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verse 187

أُحِلَّ لَكُمْ لَيْلَةَ الصِّيَامِ الرَّفَثُ إِلَىٰ نِسَائِكُمْ ۚ هُنَّ لِبَاسٌ لَكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ لِبَاسٌ لَهُنَّ
عَلِمَ اللَّهُ أَنَّكُمْ كُنْتُمْ تَخْتَانُونَ أَنْفُسَكُمْ فَتَابَ عَلَيْكُمْ وَعَفَا عَنْكُمْ ۖ فَالْآنَ
بَاشِرُوهُنَّ وَابْتَغُوا مَا كَتَبَ اللَّهُ لَكُمْ ۚ وَكُلُوا وَاشْرَبُوا حَتَّىٰ يَتَبَيَّنَ لَكُمُ الْخَيْطُ
الْأَبْيَضُ مِنَ الْخَيْطِ الْأَسْوَدِ مِنَ الْفَجْرِ ۖ ثُمَّ أَتِمُّوا الصِّيَامَ إِلَى اللَّيْلِ ۚ وَلَا تُبَاشِرُوهُنَّ
وَأَنْتُمْ عَاكِفُونَ فِي الْمَسَاجِدِ ۗ تِلْكَ حُدُودُ اللَّهِ فَلَا تَقْرَبُوهَا ۗ كَذَٰلِكَ يُبَيِّنُ اللَّهُ
آيَاتِهِ لِلنَّاسِ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَّقُونَ ﴿١٨٧﴾

(2:187) ***It is made lawful to you on the night of the fast to go in unto your wives; they are an apparel for you and you are an apparel for them; Allah knew that you were acting unfaithfully to yourselves, so He has turned to you [mercifully] and forgiven you. Wherefore, now be in contact with them and seek what Allah has written for you, and eat and drink until the white thread becomes distinct unto you from the black thread [of night] at dawn-break, then complete the fast until night. And associate not with them while you are confined in the mosques. These are the limits [prescribed by] Allah; therefore, draw not yourselves near them. Thus does Allah make clear His signs for the people, so that they may guard themselves [against evil].***

Commentary

It is made lawful to you on the night of the fast to go in unto your wives: *Iḥlāl* means to allow; its root is *ḥall* (to open) which is opposite of *ʿaqd* (to tie)

Rafath literally means to say clearly such words which are generally unmentionable, which are normally only hinted at; such words are usually uttered during sexual intercourse. Now, this "uttering unmentionable words" has been used as a metaphor of the sexual intercourse; and this is

the nobility of the exalted Qur'an. And all words used for this meaning in the Qur'an are of the same type; none were made for copulation, all are used as a metaphor, like *mubāshirah* (to be in contact with each other), *dukhūl* (to enter), *mass* or *lams* (to touch), *ityān* (to come to), *qurb* (to be near), and so on. The same is the case of the words, *waṭʾ* (to press down) and *jimāʿ* (to come together) which are used in Islamic books other than the Qur'an, although some of these words have been so much used for this meaning that now they are no longer metaphoric. The words, *farj* (an opening) and *ghāʾit* (the depth), which are now commonly used for "vulva" and "excrement" respectively, are the other examples of this type.

It is said that the preposition *ilā* (to) coming here after *rafath* gives the meaning of entering into.

… they are an apparel for you and you are an apparel for them: *Libās* means what a man uses to cover his body. The two sentences are used figuratively, because each spouse restrains the other from unchastity, and protects society from debauchery. Thus each one is like an apparel for the other with which he/she covers his/her shame and protects his/her privacy.

It is a very fine metaphor, and its literary value has been increased by putting it after the sentence, *It is made lawful to you … to go in unto your wives*. A man hides his private parts from others with his dress, but there is no hiding from the dress itself. Likewise, each spouse protects the other one from having sexual relations with others; but there is no restriction on them against such relations with each other.

… Allah knew that you were acting unfaithfully to yourselves, so He has turned to you [mercifully] and forgiven you? *Ikhtiyān* and *khiyānah* are synonymous; and it is said that they convey the meaning of defect, decrease. You were acting unfaithfully conveys the meaning of continuity; and it shows that this unfaithfulness commonly continued among the Muslims after the command of the fast had been promulgated; and they were sinning against God secretly by being unfaithful to their own souls. Had not this unfaithfulness been a sin, there would have been no need to mention turning to them mercifully and forgiving; and although these two words do not say openly that a sin had already been committed, still their most obvious meaning shows a preceding sin, especially when both are mentioned together.

Accordingly, the verse proves that before its revelation, sexual intercourse in the nights of the fast was forbidden; and that it was this verse

which made it lawful and abrogated its prohibition, as has been stated by a group of the commentators of the Qur'an. As a further proof, look at the words, *It is made lawful to you … you were acting unfaithfully, so He has turned to you [mercifully] and forgiven you and Wherefore, now be in contact with them*. Had there been no previous prohibition, such words would have been out of context; instead there would have come the words like "there is no blame on you that you be in contact with them."

Some people say: "This verse does not abrogate any rule, because the verse of fasting mentioned earlier did not prohibit intercourse or food or drink in the night. Apparently, according to some Sunni traditions, when the fast was prescribed and the words were revealed, *Fasting has been prescribed for you as it was prescribed for those before you* refers to the fast per se, and not meant total conformity in all the details of fast. It is said that the Christians used to eat, drink and go to their women during the early period of the night, then abstained from it. So the Muslims adopted the same system. But it proved difficult. Many youths could not restrain themselves from secret sexual intercourse, but they thought that they were committing a sin and acting unfaithfully to themselves. Likewise, aged persons found it a heavy burden to abstain from eating and drinking once they began their sleep. Sometimes someone could not keep his eyes open before eating and drinking and then thought that food and drink was unlawful for him. It was to remove this misunderstanding that this verse was revealed; it made it clear that sexual intercourse, food and drink was not unlawful for them during the night of Ramaḍān. This verse also made it clear that the comparison in "as it was prescribed for those before you" refers to the fast as such, and not to its details. The words, *It is made lawful to you* do not necessarily mean that this was unlawful before that; it simply declares legality of this action. See, for example, the words: *The game of the sea is made lawful to you* (5:96); as it is known that the game of the sea was not unlawful to the pilgrims before the revelation of this verse. Likewise, the words, *Allah knew that you were acting unfaithfully to yourselves* means that they were doing wrong according to their own view only. That is why God said "unfaithfully to yourselves." Had He said "unfaithfully to God," it would have conveyed the meaning of prohibition, as, for example, in the verse: *Be you not unfaithful to Allah and the Messenger* (8:27). Also the word *ikhtiyān* may be taken to mean "curtail" or "decrease" and the sentence may be translated as "God knew that you

were curtailing your desires." The words, *He has turned to you [mercifully] and has forgiven you* do not clearly convey the idea that sexual intercourse was a sin before that.

But this argument is not conclusive, because it goes against the clear meaning of the verse. We have already said that the words like, *It is made lawful to you … you were acting unfaithfully, so He has turned to you [mercifully] and forgiven you* do not say openly that a sin had already been committed; still, this is their most obvious implication. Add to it the words now be in contact with them which would be inappropriate if there were no previous prohibition, as we have explained earlier.

The argument, that "this verse does not abrogate any rule because the verse of fasting did not prohibit sexual intercourse in the night," is not valid because that verse did not prohibit it clearly for the day time also. It is known that the Messenger of God had explained the rules of fasting before this verse was revealed. Perhaps the prohibition of sexual relations during the night was one of those rules; and the verse abrogated it. So this verse cancels not another verse, but a tradition of the Prophet.

Someone may object: The words, *they are an apparel for you and you are an apparel for them* have been used as the reason for this permission. Now, the husband and wife were like apparel to each other when, supposedly, copulation at night was forbidden and they remained like the apparel when that prohibition was supposedly lifted. So where, in these words, is the reason for the supposed abrogation if they are equally true in both conditions—before abrogation and after abrogation? We know that the reason given for a rule of the shariah is mostly its benefit, and not necessarily its real causes. And as a benefit, it need not be fully comprehensive. Still, in a supposedly abrogating verse at least it should not be common to both conditions.

But deep consideration of the verse does not sustain this objection. It is not acceptable that this sentence is the reason of this permission. The permission in this verse is limited to the night of the fast, while the simile of apparel is as much true during the day as in the night. So, it cannot be the reason of that permission.

The fact is that the three clauses in this verse coming one after the other, and all taken together, give us the reason for this abrogation. They are: *on the night of the fast, they are an apparel for you …, and you were acting unfaithfully to yourselves*.

As the spouses are like apparel to each other they should be allowed to establish sexual relations together without any restriction. Then came the commandment of the fast, without demanded self-denial and abstention from desires, like food, drink and sexual relations. But the servants of God found it difficult to abstain for a full month from copulation, and this unfaithfulness was common and continued. Therefore, God in His mercy eased the conditions and lightened their burden by allowing it during the night.

In this way, the general implication of the sentence of apparel is made subordinate to the fast; and thus is limited to the night time only (when there is no fast).

In short, the sentence of apparel is not a reason for this permission; rather it is the reason or benefit of copulation as such. The main aim of the whole verse is to explain why copulation was allowed in the night of fast. And the sentence beginning with *they are an apparel* and ending on *forgiven you* taken together show this reason, not any single sentence alone. And this reason is not found in the rule which was followed before this permission.

… Wherefore, now be in contact with them and seek what Allah has written for you: This is an order preceded by prohibition; thus it means permission. The verse begins with the words, *It is made lawful to you*. The meaning, therefore, is, "from now on you are allowed to establish sexual relations with them." *Ibtighā*ʾ means 'to seek,' 'to desire.' *Seek what Allah has written for you* means seeking the children which God has written to give to the mankind. God created in human beings the desire to copulate and made it the means of that gift (of children) and to some extent put them under the pressure of that desire. When a couple engages in that action, they are in reality seeking what God has written for them, even if at that time their only aim is to satisfy their sexual desire or lust. It is like taking food and drink. God had written that their lives, growth and health depend on food and drink, and that remains the goal of nature even when they, at that particular time, do not look further than satisfying their hunger and thirst or to pamper their gustatory pleasure. This is the compulsion put on them by God in all such matters.

It has been said: *What Allah has written for you* means "what God has allowed to you"; and the implication is that they should take advantage of this permission. God likes His servants to take advantage of His

permission as He likes them to obey His compulsory commandments.

But his view is not acceptable, because we have not seen a single instance in the Qur'an where "writing" is used for 'permission.'

… and eat and drink until the white thread becomes distinct unto you from the black thread [of night] at dawn-break, then complete the fast until night: There are two dawns: the first is called the 'false' dawn because it vanishes in a short time. It is also called the 'tail of the wolf' because it looks as if a tail is raised. This false dawn is a beam of light like a vertical column; it appears at the end of the night on the eastern horizon when the sun reaches an angle of 18 degrees below the horizon. Then it gives way to a horizontal line of light which looks as if a white thread has been stretched on the horizon. This is the second dawn. It is called 'true' dawn because it truthfully announces the arrival of day-time and is connected with sunrise.

Obviously, the white thread in this verse means the "true dawn"; and "at" (*min*) in "at dawn-break" (*min al-fajri*) is explanatory so as to clarify this phrase. This sentence is metaphorical and it likens the streak of light, stretched across the horizon, to a white thread and the darkness of night adjoining that light to a black thread.

This shows that the limit of the given permission is exactly the beginning of the true dawn; because soon after, when the sun comes nearer to the horizon, both threads disappear. There remains neither the white thread nor the black.

… then complete the fast until night: As the start of the fast was from the dawn-break, there was no need to say, 'keep the fast during day-time.' Instead its other limit is now mentioned in these words.

Complete the fast shows that the fast of one day is one unit, a single act of worship which is not made up of a various parts. There is a difference between completion (*tamām*) and perfection (*kamāl*). Completion (*tamām*), the word used in this verse, means that a single thing (which is not made of such parts which may have separate functions) finally comes into being. Perfection (*kamāl*) means that a single thing (which has various parts and every part has a separate function) finally comes into being. God says: *This day I perfected* (akmaltu) *for you your religion and completed* (atmamtu) *My favor on you* (5:3). The religion is a collection of various things like prayer, fast, hajj and so on, and all these have a separate effect; therefore, the religion was "perfected." But the favor of

God is one thing without any parts (as we will explain under that verse); therefore, it was "completed."

And associate not with them while you are confined in the mosques: *ʿUkūf* and *iʿtikāf* both mean "to keep close to." When used with the name of a place, they mean to remain continuously in that place.

Iʿtikāf is an act of worship. When in *iʿtikāf*, one must remain inside a mosque, not going out without a genuine reason (example, to relieve oneself); and fasting is an essential part of this act of worship.

As the Muslims were given permission to have sexual relations with their wives in the night of fast, there was a possibility that they might think that permission extended to the nights of *iʿtikāf* also, when they were inside a mosque. This sentence removed the chance of any such misunderstanding.

These are the limits [prescribed by] Allah; therefore, draw not yourselves near them. Thus does Allah make clear His signs for the people, so that they may guard themselves [against evil]: *Ḥadd* (limit) literally means "to keep from," "to restrict." All its uses carry this meaning; for example, *ḥadd al-sayf* (edge of sword), *ḥadd al-dār* (boundary of the house), *ḥadd al-fujūr* (punishment of immorality) and so on. Therefore the phrase, *ḥudūd allāh* mentioned in the verse, means, the "restrictive ordinances of God" and the command not to go near them figuratively means not to commit that sin. In short, it says: you should not commit the sins mentioned here, that is, eating, drinking and copulating during the prohibited hours; you should not trespass beyond the limits ordained for you; you should not neglect the fast or the guarding of yourselves against evil in the period of that special worship.

Examining Narrations

(1) Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "Food and copulation were unlawful in the month of Ramaḍān at night after sleeping." (That is, if one prayed the prayer of *al-ʿishāʾ* and slept without breaking one's fast, then, he was not allowed to eat or drink even if he awoke later in the night. And sexual intercourse was unlawful in the month of Ramaḍān both in the day and in the night.) There was a companion of the Messenger of God, Khawwāt b. Jubayr al-Ansārī. He was brother of ʿAbdullāh b. Jubayr, who in the battle of Uḥud, was deputed by the Messenger of God at the mouth

of the mountain-pass with fifty archers; most of them left him, but he remained at this station with only twelve soldiers and was martyred there. His brother Khawwāt b. Jubayr, was an aged and weak person, and was fasting with the Messenger of God in the battle of the Khandaq (Trench). In the evening he came to his house and asked: "Do you have any food?" They said: "Do not go to sleep; we shall prepare some food for you." There was some delay in cooking and he was overcome with sleep before breaking his fast. When he woke up he said to his family: "Now eating is forbidden to me tonight." Next day, he presented himself at the Khandaq and fainted. The Messenger of God looked at him and felt pity for him. Also, there were some youths who had secretly indulged in sexual relations at night in the month of Ramaḍān. Therefore God sent down (the verse); *It is made lawful to you on the night of fast to go in unto your wives …* Thus God allowed sexual relations during the nights of the month of Ramaḍān, and eating after going to sleep up to the dawn-break, as He said, *until the white thread becomes distinct from the black thread [of night] at dawn-break*. The Imam said: "It means the whiteness of the day from the darkness of the night." (*al-Tafsīr*, al-Qummī)

Author's comment: The sentences (given in bracket), starting with "That is" and ending up to "both in the day and in the night," are explanatory notes of the narrator of this tradition.

This episode is narrated in other traditions also, by al-Kulaynī, al-ʿAyyāshī and others. All these traditions say that the words, *eat and drink …* were revealed because of the event of Khawwāt b. Jubayr al-Anṣārī; and the words, *It is made lawful to you …* were revealed because of the secret doings of some Muslim youths.

(2) There is another tradition in *al-Durr al-manthūr* from various commentators and traditionalists from Barāʾ b. ʿĀzib who said: "It was the custom among the companions of the Prophet that if someone fasted and the time of *iftār* (breaking thefast) came but he went to sleep before breaking his fast, he did not eat that night and fasted the next day without eating anything, till the next evening came. Once Qays b. Ṣarmah al-Anṣārī fasted, and that day he had been working in the field. The time came for breaking the fast and he came to his wife and asked: 'Do you have any food?' He

could not keep awake and went to sleep. When his wife returned and found him sleeping she said: 'Woe unto you! Did you go to sleep?' In the noon of the next day, he fainted. This was reported to the Prophet. Then this verse was sent down: *It is made lawful to you on the night of the fast … at dawn-break*. And the Muslims were extremely happy at it."

Author's comment: This story is narrated by other chains also. In some of them the name is given as Abū Qubays b. Ṣarmah; in others, Ṣarmah b. Mālik al-Anṣārī. There is some variation in the story also.

(3) Ibn Jarīr and Ibn al-Mundhir have narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās as follows: "The Muslims were forbidden (sexual relations with) women and food in the month of Ramaḍān once they had prayed the prayer of *al-ʿishāʾ*, till the next evening. But some of them ate food and had sexual intercourse with women after the *al-ʿishāʾ* in one Ramaḍān; one of them was ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. Then they complained about it to the Messenger of God. Therefore God sent down the verse, *It is made lawful to you … be in contact with them*. (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: There are numerous traditions from Sunni chains about this matter; most of them mention the name of ʿUmar. All say with one voice that the rule about sexual intercourse in the night of Ramaḍān was the same as that about food and drink: All of these were allowed before the sleep, forbidden after it. But the obvious meaning of the first tradition is that the sexual intercourse was completely forbidden in the month of Ramaḍān, during the night as well as in the day-time; and the food and drink were allowed before sleeping, forbidden after that. And the context of the verse supports this tradition. Had the sexual relation been like food and drink (allowed before sleeping and forbidden after) it would have been necessary to mention here the farthest limit of the permission, as was done about food and drink (*eat and drink until the white thread becomes distinct…*) But it only says: *It is made lawful to you on the night of the fast to go in unto your wives*, without putting any limit to it. It shows that previously they were forbidden to indulge in this act the whole "night of the fast."

Some traditions say (and the one quoted last is one of them) that the Muslims were acting unfaithfully not only in the matter of sexual relations, but also in food and drink. But the sequence of the sentences of the

verse does not support it. The sentence, God knew that you were acting unfaithfully … is put in the middle of the permission for sexual relations and the words eat and drink appear after this topic has ended. Therefore the "acting unfaithfully" cannot be connected with eating and drinking.

(4) Verily, the Messenger of God said: "The dawn is of two kinds. The one which looks like the tail of the wolf does not allow anything, nor prohibits anything. But the long one which covers the horizon allows the prayer (of dawn) and prohibits food." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: The traditions of this meaning are nearly *mutawātir* from Sunni and Shia sources; as are the ones about *iʿtikāf* and prohibition of sexual intercourse in that period.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verse 188

وَلَا تَأْكُلُوا أَمْوَالَكُمْ بَيْنَكُمْ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَتُدْلُوا بِهَا إِلَى الْحُكَّامِ لِتَأْكُلُوا فَرِيقًا مِنْ أَمْوَالِ النَّاسِ بِالْإِثْمِ وَأَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ ﴿١٨٨﴾

(2:188) ***And do not swallow up your property among yourselves by wrongful means; neither seek to gain access thereby to the authorities, so that you may swallow up a portion of the property of men wrongfully while you know .***

Commentary

And do not swallow up your property among yourselves by wrongful means: *Akl* (to eat, to swallow up) metaphorically means 'to take hold of, or to make use of.' The reason of this metaphorical use is that eating is the most common and the earliest natural desire; as soon as his life begins, man feels the need of food and then gradually proceeds to other needs like clothing, habitation and marriage, and so on. Acquiring food is his first natural action and wilful doing. That is why if one uses or takes a thing it is said one has eaten it, and especially so in the case of wealth and property. And this figure of speech is common to all languages.

Māl (wealth, property) literally means the possession which is desired. It seems that its root is *mayl* (inclination, desire, bent), because it is one of those things to which the heart is inclined, which it desires. *Baynakum* (among yourselves) and *bayn* means the gap between two or more things.

Wrong (*bāṭil*) is opposite of truth (*ḥaqq*); *ḥaqq* means a thing which is confirmed.

The proviso *among yourselves* added after the command *do not swallow up your property* shows that wealth is for all the people; but God has distributed it among them—a just distribution—by promulgating laws based on justice and equity, which cut at the roots of corruption and immorality. If anybody trespasses the limits put by these laws, it will be invalid and wrong. This verse, in a way, explains the verse: *He it is who created for you all that is in the earth* (2:29).

***Your property* (amwālakum):** History and ancient tradition show that ever since man put his foot on this globe, society has recognized the right to property and upheld it in one way or other. By using this possessive pronoun, God confirms this right. This principle has been mentioned in the Qur'an in more than a hundred places, in various words like kingdom (*mulk*), property (*māl*), the preposition 'for' (*l…*) used for possession, and *istikhlāf* (to make man God's deputy on earth); but there is no need to quote the references here. Likewise all the verses which regulate selling, trade and other commercial dealings implicitly recognise this right. For example: *and Allah has allowed trading* (2:275), *do not swallow up your property among yourselves by wrongful means, except that it be trading by your mutual consent* (4:29), *and the trade dullness of which you fear* (9:25) and other such references. And authentic (*mutawātir*) traditions support it.

… neither seek to gain access thereby to the authorities, so that you may swallow up a portion of the property of man wrongfully while you know: *Idlāʾ* (translated here as "to gain access") literally means to send the bucket (*dalūʾ*) down into the well for drawing water. Its metaphorical use in this verse implies offering money, and so on, to the authorities to induce them to give judgement in favor of the bribe-giver. It is a very nice allegory. The desired judgement is the water in the depth of the well; the bribe is the bucket which is sent down to bring the desired result.

A portion (farīqan)*:* It is a part separated from the whole. This sentence is in conjunction with the word *swallow up*; therefore, grammatically it is a prohibitory verb, and hence the sign of quiescence.

Another possibility: The "and" (*w…*) (the conjunction word not appearing in the above translation) may be taken to mean "with" (*maʿ*), and further it may be presumed that after it, the word that (*inna*) is implied. In this case the whole verse will be one sentence and will mean: "… by wrongful means with seeking to gain access **…**" Thus, the verse prohibits the mutual understanding between the bribe-giver and bribe-taker so that they wrongfully swallow up the property of the people by sharing it between themselves—the bribe-taker taking the portion which has been offered to him, and the giver usurping the other portion—while they know that it is wrong and unjust.

Examining Narrations

(1) In a tradition, Imam al-Ṣādiq says about this verse: "The Arabs

used to gamble with their wives and property. So, God prohibited them to do so." (*al-Kāfī*)

(2) Abū Basīr says: "I asked Abū ʿAbdullāh the meaning of the words of God in His book: and do not swallow up your property among yourselves by wrongful means; neither seek to gain access thereby to the authorities. He (the Imam) said: 'O Abū Basīr! Verily God knew that there would be in this *ummah* judges who would do injustice. Verily, He did not mean (here) judges of a just authority, but He meant those of an unjust authority. O Abū Muḥammad! (that is, Abū Basīr) If you had a right against someone and you summoned him to the judges of a just authority, but he did not agree to it and compelled you to put your case before the judges of an unjust authority, so that they might decide in his favor, then that man would be among those who had resorted to the judgement of the *ṭāghūt* (Satan). And it is the word of God: *Have you not observed those who think that they believe in what has been sent down unto you and what was sent down before you? They intend to resort to the judgement of ṭāghūt* (Satan)*, though they were commanded to deny [reject] him …* (4:60)' " (*ibid.*)

(3) There is a tradition from Abū Jaʿfar: "The meaning of 'wrongful means' is the false oath with which property is usurped." (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: All the above traditions give some examples, but the verse is general.

On Social Science

All organic things, vegetable, animal and human beings make use of other things to sustain their lives. They actively take advantage of those surrounding things which may help in their continued existence.

We have never heard of a thing which exists but is not active, or an action which is done without the doer expecting its benefit to return to him. Remark the vegetable kingdom which does whatever it does with the single aim of benefiting from it in its existence, growth, and reproduction. Similarly, all animals and human beings do whatever they do with the aim of getting benefit one way or another, even if that benefit be only in the imagination and thought.

Plants have been taught by the Creator, and animals and men know by

their instinct that they cannot use any material for the fulfilment of their natural needs and the protection of their existence unless that material has a very special relation to them; in other words, unless it belongs to them. They know that one deed cannot be done by two doers. Accordingly, man and animal and so on prohibit others from interfering in their affairs and do not allow anything to utilize what they want to utilize for themselves. This is the foundation of this special relation—namely, possession which is recognized by one and all. Hence the words 'my,' 'your,' and so on.

For a further proof, look at any animal fighting to remove others from its territory, its prey, or its mate. Again, see children quarrelling for, and defending, whatever food, or toy, they have got. Even a suckling infant does not allow another infant to suck at the same breast. This is the lesson taught by nature. When man, being a social animal, established society, that natural instinct was bound to become more pronounced; and eventually became a well organized and well balanced system that took the shape of social ethics and moral values; gradually the basic concept of that special relation branched off into various kinds with different names: the monetary relation was named 'property,' the nonmonetary, 'right,' and so on.

Human beings may have different views on the legality of various means of acquiring property, like inheritance, trade, confiscation by the ruling authority, and so on, or on the suitability of the owner, whether he is adult or minor, sane or idiot, a single person or a group, and so on. But there is no escape from recognizing the basic principle of ownership. That is why even those who apparently reject the idea of ownership, have only transferred it from the individual to the society or the state.

Even then, they have not been able to abolish private ownership totally; and they will never be able to do so, because it is the verdict of nature, and if nature is rejected, man will perish.

We shall discuss, God willing, in their proper places the details of this basic principle, according to the means of its acquirement, such as trade, profit, inheritance, war-booty, collection, and so on, and according to the status of the owner, that is, adult or minor, and so on.

almizan.org

Verse 189

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْأَهِلَّةِ ۖ قُلْ هِيَ مَوَاقِيتُ لِلنَّاسِ وَالْحَجِّ ۗ وَلَيْسَ الْبِرُّ بِأَنْ تَأْتُوا
الْبُيُوتَ مِنْ ظُهُورِهَا وَلَٰكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنِ اتَّقَىٰ ۗ وَأْتُوا الْبُيُوتَ مِنْ أَبْوَابِهَا ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ
لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُونَ ﴿١٨٩﴾

(2:189) ***They ask you concerning the new moons. Say, they are [indications of] times fixed for men and [for] the pilgrimage. And it is not righteousness that you should enter the houses from their backs; but righteousness is the one who guards himself [against evil]; and enter the houses by their doors and fear Allah, so that you may be successful.***

Commentary

They ask you concerning the new moons. Say, they are [indications of] times fixed for men and [for] the pilgrimage: *Ahillah* is plural of *hilāl* (crescent). The moon is called *hilāl* at the beginning of the lunar month when it comes away from the direct rays of the sun; it is named crescent (*hilāl*) on the first and second nights according to one group, while some others say that it is named so for the first three nights; still others say that this name continues until a faint circle of light shows the outline of the moon. A fourth group says that it is a "crescent" until its light brightens the night; this occurs on the seventh night, after which it is simply called moon (*qamar*) and on the fourteenth night it becomes full noon (*badr*). Its general name in Arabic is *zibriqān*.

The Arabs say *istahalla al-ṣabiyy* when the newly born child cries soon after birth. Also they say *ahallaʾl-qawmu bi al-ḥajj* when the pilgrims call out loudly *labbayk Allāhumma labbayk*. Thus the root H-L-L gives the idea of raising one's voice, and the new moon is called *hilāl* because people hail it and raise their voice to point it out.

Mawāqit is plural of *mīqāt* which means the time appointed for a work. It also means the place appointed for it, as we say: The *mīqāt* of the Syrians or the Yemenis, which means the place where they wear the

robes of *iḥrām* for pilgrimage. In this verse it has the first meaning, that is, the appointed time.

They ask you concerning the new moons. It does not say what the question was. Some say that they wanted to know the reality of the moon and why it appeared in different shapes from night to night. Others think that they wished to know the reason for the reappearance of the new moon after its disappearing at the end of the month.

But the word used is *ahillah* (new moons) in the plural, and it proves that the question was not about the reality of the moon or its various phases; because in that case it would have been appropriate to say "they ask you concerning the moon" not "the new moons." And if the question was about the reason of the new moon, the proper words would be "they ask you concerning the new moon." In both cases the use of the plural would be inappropriate. This plural "new moons" proves that the question was: What is the reason or benefit of the appearance of the moon as crescent after crescent and of its marking the lunar months? This question was shortened into "new moons" because it is the new moon which starts a new month; and then its benefit was explained.

This question may be inferred from the reply: *say they are [indications of] times fixed for men and [for] pilgrimage*. The times fixed for various actions and activities are the 'months,' and not the various shapes of the moon but about the lunar months which are marked by the new moons. And God explained that these months were the times fixed for the benefit of man in affairs of their material and spiritual lives. Man, by his nature, is obliged to measure all his activities by time. It was, therefore, necessary to divide time (which is the yard-stick of his actions) into various short and long portions. The mercy of God which looks after the affairs of His creatures, and guides them towards the betterment of their lives, effected this division by creating night, day, month, season and year and so on. The most obvious and the clearest division is the grouping of the days in the lunar months. Everyone may benefit from it, be he a scholar or an ignorant person, a bedouin or a city-dweller; everyone can observe the beginning of the new moon if his eye-sight is correct; and everyone may easily keep its count. These benefits are conspicuously absent in the solar calendar: mane did not wake to this idea, and could not come to grips with its complicated reckoning, until many centuries after human society came into being. Moreover, not every one can always know the

dates of the solar calendar.

Therefore, the lunar months are the times fixed and prescribed for men for their use in their material and spiritual affairs, and especially so for the hajj (pilgrimage) because it is performed in the known months.

The hajj has especially been mentioned here as an introduction to the topic which is dealt with in the following sentences.

And it is not righteousness that you should enter the houses from their backs: It is known from the reports that in the days before Islam it was the custom of some Arabs that after wearing the robes of *iḥrām* for pilgrimage, if they had to enter their houses for any reason, they did not use the doors, but cut a hole in the wall for that purpose. Islam disapproved that practice and told them to enter the houses from their doors. The verse has been revealed in a way that the above-mentioned report may be believed to be true.

Had there been no such reliable report, these words could be interpreted metaphorically as a prohibition of performing religious rites in any way other than the prescribed one. For example, pilgrimage should not be done but in its prescribed months, fast should not be kept in any month other than Ramaḍān, and so on. In that case, the sentence would have been complementary to the previous one. The meaning would have been: These months are the times prescribed for the religious deeds fixed for them, and it is not permitted to transfer those deeds to other months, like doing hajj outside the prescribed months or fasting in a month other than Ramaḍān.

But the first interpretation is supported by the traditions. The words, it is not righteousness to enter the houses from their backs, proves that this practice was never approved of by the religion; otherwise it would not have been said to be against righteousness. It was just a bad custom of the pre-Islamic times; and God said that it was not righteousness. Rather, righteousness was the fear of God and guarding oneself against evil.

… but righteousness is the one who guards himself [against evil]: Apparently, the sentence should have been "but righteousness is guarding oneself (against evil)," but God used the expression *the one who guards himself* to show that the real virtue is in practicing "piety," and not in its abstract idea. It is like the verse: *It is not righteousness that you turn your faces towards the east and the west but righteousness is the one who believes in Allah …* (2:177)

… and enter the houses by their doors: It is not a compulsory order; it is a guidance that entering into houses from their doors is the proper method, as it is the usual and recognized way. People build houses and put doors in them for this very purpose, and there is no reason why a hole should be drilled for entering into, or going out of, the house. This sentence admonishes them not to follow a foolish custom which goes against common sense. In short, the sentence does not say that it is obligatory on every one to enter into a house through the door. It just tells them that it is the proper way. Of course, if one enters into a house by a way other than the door, thinking that this custom is a part of religion, then it will be an "unlawful innovation."

… and fear Allah, so that you may be successful: It was mentioned in the beginning of this Chapter that *taqwā* (piety) is virtue which gathers in its fold all ranks of the faith and all stages of perfection. Obviously, not every stage and rank leads one to spiritual success and happiness, as do the last stages which remove all shades of polytheism and misdirection. It is these last stages which guide one to success and bring the good tidings of happiness. That is why God said, *so that you may be successful*, using the word 'may.'

Also, it is possible to interpret the words, "fear God," here as following this particular order, and discarding the practice of going into houses from their backs.

Examining Narrations

(1) Ibn Jarīr and Ibn Abī Ḥātim have narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās that he said: "The people asked the Messenger of God concerning the new moons. Then this verse was revealed, They ask you concerning the new moons. Say, 'they are (indications of) times fixed for men'; they know from them the time their loans are due, the waiting period (number of months a women must wait after divorce or the death of her husband before the next marriage) of their women and the time of their pilgrimage." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: Some others from different chains are from Abu al-ʿĀliyah, Qatādah and others. There is another tradition that someone asked the Prophet about the various phases of the moon; so this verse was sent down. But we have already commented on this report that it is against the apparent meaning of the verse, and, therefore, is not worthy

of consideration.

(2) There is a tradition reported by Wakīʿ, al-Bukhārī and Ibn Jarīr from al-Barāʾ. In the days of "ignorance," when they wore the *iḥrām*, they used to go into the house from its back. There fore, God sent down the. verse And it is not righteousness that you should enter the houses from their backs; but righteousness is the one who guards himself (against evil); and enter the houses by their doors. (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(3) There is another tradition reported by Ibn Abī Ḥātim and al-Ḥākim (and he has said that it is "correct") from Jābir. He said: "The Quraysh were called *ḥums* (enthusiastic, strenuous), and they used to enter by the doors in the condition of *iḥrām*. The *anṣār* (helpers) and other Arabs did not enter from the door in *iḥrām*. Once the Messenger of God was in a garden, and came out from its door, and Quṭbah b. ʿĀmir al-Anṣārī came out with him. The people said, 'O Messenger of God! Verily Quṭbah b. ʿĀmir is a sinner, he came out with you from the door.' The Prophet asked him: 'Why did you do so?' He replied: 'I saw you doing it, so I did as you did.' The Prophet said: 'I am an *aḥmas* (that is, Qurayshite).' He said: 'But my religion is your religion.' Then God sent down: *it is not righteousness that you should enter the houses from their backs*. (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: Other traditions of nearly the same meaning have been narrated from other chains. *Ḥums* is the plural of *aḥmas* from *ḥimāsah* which means "hardiness." The tribe of Quraysh was called *ḥums* because of their zeal in the matter of their religion, or because of their bravery and strength.

Apparently, this tradition shows that the Messenger of God had allowed the continuation of that custom by non-Qurayshites before this incident; and that is why he admonished him in these words: "Why did you do so?" If we accept this view then this verse was revealed to abrogate a rule which was enforced not by a verse but by the order of the Prophet. But you already know that the verse does not support this view. It says, *it is not righteousness that you should enter …* It is unimaginable that God or His Messenger on divine command enforced a rule and then God at the time of its abrogation condemned and criticized it as being against righteousness.

(4) Imam al-Bāqir said about the word of God, *and enter the houses by their doors*: "God means that every affair, whatever it may be, should be approached in its (proper) way." (*al-Maḥāsin*)

(5) Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "The imams (*al-awṣiyāʾ*) are the doors of God, from which God is approached; and had they not been there, God would not have been known; and it is through them that God has established His proof over His creatures." (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: This tradition gives an example of the general meaning of this verse, which has been explained in the previous one. There is no doubt that the verse is general in its meaning, even if it was sent down on a particular occasion. The Imam said: "had they not been there, God would not have been known." This refers to the true explanation of religion and the complete Call (Mission of the Prophet) which are with them. This sentence has a deeper meaning also; maybe we shall explain it later on. There are numerous traditions of the same meaning as given in these two.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verses 190-195

وَقَاتِلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ وَلَا تَعْتَدُوا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ
﴿١٩٠﴾ وَاقْتُلُوهُمْ حَيْثُ ثَقِفْتُمُوهُمْ وَأَخْرِجُوهُمْ مِنْ حَيْثُ أَخْرَجُوكُمْ ۚ وَالْفِتْنَةُ أَشَدُّ
مِنَ الْقَتْلِ ۚ وَلَا تُقَاتِلُوهُمْ عِنْدَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ حَتَّىٰ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِيهِ ۖ فَإِنْ قَاتَلُوكُمْ
فَاقْتُلُوهُمْ ۗ كَذَٰلِكَ جَزَاءُ الْكَافِرِينَ ﴿١٩١﴾ فَإِنِ انْتَهَوْا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ ﴿١٩٢﴾
وَقَاتِلُوهُمْ حَتَّىٰ لَا تَكُونَ فِتْنَةٌ وَيَكُونَ الدِّينُ لِلَّهِ ۖ فَإِنِ انْتَهَوْا فَلَا عُدْوَانَ إِلَّا
عَلَى الظَّالِمِينَ ﴿١٩٣﴾ الشَّهْرُ الْحَرَامُ بِالشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ وَالْحُرُمَاتُ قِصَاصٌ ۚ فَمَنِ اعْتَدَىٰ
عَلَيْكُمْ فَاعْتَدُوا عَلَيْهِ بِمِثْلِ مَا اعْتَدَىٰ عَلَيْكُمْ ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ
مَعَ الْمُتَّقِينَ ﴿١٩٤﴾ وَأَنْفِقُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَلَا تُلْقُوا بِأَيْدِيكُمْ إِلَى التَّهْلُكَةِ ۛ وَأَحْسِنُوا
إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُحْسِنِينَ ﴿١٩٥﴾

(2:190) *And fight in the way of Allah with those who fight with you and do not exceed the limits. Verily, Allah loves not those who exceed the limit.*

(2:191) *And kill them wherever you find them and drive them out from whence they drove you out; and mischief [disbelief] is more grievous than slaughter; and do not fight with them at the Sacred Mosque until they fight with you therein; but if they do fight you than slay them; such is the recompense of the unbelievers.*

(2:192) *But if they desist, then verily Allah is forgiving, Merciful.*

(2:193) *And fight with them until there is no [more] mischief [disbelief], and religion be only for Allah; but if they desist then there should be no hostility except against the oppressors.*

(2:194) *The sacred month for the sacred month and reprisal [is lawful] in all sacred things; whoever then acts aggressively against you,*

inflict the like aggression on him as he has inflicted on you,. and fear Allah and know that Allah is with those who guard [against evil].

(2:195) *And spend in the way of Allah and cast not yourselves into perdition with your own hands; and do good; verily Allah loves those who do good.*

almizan.org

Introduction

The context of the verses shows that they were revealed together. The whole talk has only one aim; permission, for the first time, of fighting with the polytheists of Mecca. These verses refer to driving them out from whence they drove the believers out, to disbelief and to reprisal; they prohibit fighting with them at the Sacred Mosque unless they fight the believers in it. All these matters were connected with the polytheists of Mecca. Also, the sentence: fight in the way of God with those who fight with you, deserves more attention. It is not a condition, that is, it does not mean, "fight with them if they fight with you." Nor is it a restrictive clause (as some people think) meaning, "fight with the men, and not with their women and children who are not in a position to fight with you," because nobody "fights" with those who are unable to fight back. Had it been the aim of the sentence, it would have been proper to say "do not kill them." Therefore, the words those who fight with you only refer to a fact—fight those who are presently engaged in fighting against you. And it points to the polytheists of Mecca.

The verses have the same significance as the following verses: *Permission [to fight] is given to those upon whom war is made, for they have been oppressed, and most surely Allah is able to help them; those who have been expelled from their homes without a just cause except that they say, Our Lord is Allah* (22:39-40). These verses also contain the initial (but unconditional) permission to fight with the fighting polytheists.

These six verses (2:190-195) together promulgate a single law covering all its limits and details. *And fight in the way of Allah* is the basic law; and *do not exceed the limit* puts disciplinary restriction on it; *And kill them wherever you find them* defines the limits of pressure; *and do not fight with them at the Sacred Mosque until they fight with you therein* puts a restriction according to the place; *and fight with them until there is no more mischief* (disbelief) shows its duration; *The sacred month for the sacred month,*

and reprisal [is lawful] in all sacred things explains that this legislation is based on the principle of retaliation in fighting and killing, it is paying them in their own coin; *And spend in the way of Allah* makes the believers responsible for the financial preparations for war: they must spend for their own preparation and for that of others. Therefore, it seems that all the five verses were sent down together about one subject. It is wrong to say (as some have done) that some of these verses abrogate the others; or that they were revealed separately on different occasions. In fact, the aim of all these verses is one: permission to fight against the polytheists of Mecca who were fighting the believers.

Commentary

وَقَاتِلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ وَلَا تَعْتَدُوا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ ﴿١٩٠﴾

(2:190) ***And fight in the way of Allah with those who fight with you and do not exceed the limits. Verily, Allah loves not those who exceed the limit.***

Qitāl means attempting to kill someone who is attempting to kill you. This fight was in the way of God because its aim was to establish the religion and to raise the belief of monotheism. It was an act of worship done to gain the favor of God, and not to usurp the property of people or to damage their dignity. War in Islam is basically defensive; it protects the right of humanity sanctioned by nature, as will be explained later. Defence is by nature a limited venture; that is why God said soon after this permission, and do not exceed the limit.

… and do not exceed the limits. Verily, Allah loves not those who exceed the limit: *Iʿtidāʾ* means going beyond the boundary. The Arabs say *ʿadā* and *iʿtidāʾ* when someone goes beyond the boundary. This prohibitory order is general and covers all the situations where one may be said to exceed the limit, like fighting someone before calling him to follow the path of truth, or starting a war, or killing women and children, or not desisting from war when ordered: Its other examples are explained in the traditions of the Prophet.

وَاقْتُلُوهُمْ حَيْثُ ثَقِفْتُمُوهُمْ وَأَخْرِجُوهُمْ مِنْ حَيْثُ أَخْرَجُوكُمْ ۚ وَالْفِتْنَةُ أَشَدُّ مِنَ الْقَتْلِ ۚ وَلَا تُقَاتِلُوهُمْ عِنْدَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ حَتَّىٰ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِيهِ ۖ فَإِنْ قَاتَلُوكُمْ

فَاقْتُلُوهُمْ ۗ كَذَٰلِكَ جَزَاءُ الْكَافِرِينَ ﴿١٩١﴾

(2:191) ***And kill them wherever you find them and drive them out from whence they drove you out; and mischief [disbelief] is more grievous than slaughter; and do not fight with them at the Sacred Mosque until they fight with you therein; but if they do fight you than slay them; such is the recompense of the unbelievers:***

Thiqāfah means "to find." This sentence is similar to the verse: *then slay the polytheists wherever you find them* (9:6). *Fitnah* is the means of testing a thing. It is also used for the test itself as well as its related things like difficulty and hardship. It is also used for punishment, and the crimes and sins which bring that punishment in their wake, like polytheism, disbelief and going astray. The Qur'an has used this word in various places in all these meanings.

In this verse the word means ascribing a partner to God and disbelieving in His Messenger and persecuting and oppressing the Messenger of God and the believers as was done by the polytheists of Mecca before and after the Hijrah (migration).

The verse says: Put the utmost pressure on the polytheists by killing them wherever they be found until they are compelled to go out of their town and emigrate from their land, as they did to you. And whatever they did to you was more grievous, because it was simply a mischief and an act of infidelity; and mischief and infidelity are more grievous than killing. Killing only terminates the life of this world while infidelity terminates this life as well as the next one and destroys both worlds.

… and do not fight with them at the Sacred Mosque until they fight with you therein; but if they do fight you than slay them; such is the recompense of the unbelievers: It prohibits fighting with them at the Sacred Mosque (*Masjid al-Ḥarām*), to protect its sanctity, as long as they respect that sanctity. Therein refers to the Sacred Mosque.

فَإِنِ انْتَهَوْا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ ﴿١٩٢﴾

(2:192) ***Then if they desist, then verily Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.***

Intihāʾ means to desist from, to abstain from. *If they desist* means "if they desist from fighting near the Sacred Mosque," because the sentence is mentioned immediately after that topic. It does not mean desisting from fighting altogether by accepting Islam and obeying its commands.

However this topic comes soon after it and then God will refer to it in these words, but if they desist then there should be no hostility except against the oppressors.

Thus the two sentences refer to two completely different matters, and there is no repetition.

… then verily Allah is forgiving, Merciful: This sentence puts the cause in the place of the effect. The full meaning is: "But if they desist from fighting at the Sacred Mosque, then you must desist from it, because God is Forgiving and Merciful."

وَقَاتِلُوهُمْ حَتَّىٰ لَا تَكُونَ فِتْنَةٌ وَيَكُونَ الدِّينُ لِلَّهِ ۖ فَإِنِ انْتَهَوْا فَلَا عُدْوَانَ إِلَّا عَلَى الظَّالِمِينَ ﴿١٩٣﴾

(2:193) ***And fight with them until there is no [more] mischief [disbelief], and religion be only for Allah; but if they desist then there should be no hostility except against the oppressors:***

This defines the time-limit of the fighting. *Fitnah* (translated here as 'disbelief' and 'mischief') means here 'ascribing a partner to God and worshipping idols,' as was the custom of the polytheists of Mecca, who compelled others to do likewise. This meaning is inferred from the next sentence, *and religion be only for Allah*.

This verse is similar to the verse: *And fight with them until there is no mischief [disbelief], and the religion be only for Allah; but if they desist, then verily Allah sees what they do. And if they turn back, then know that Allah is your Master; The Most Excellent Master and the Most Excellent Helper* (8:39-40).

This verse shows that it is obligatory to call them to the right path before the war. If they accept the call, there will be no fighting; but if they reject it then there is no Master except God, and He is the most excellent Master and the most excellent Helper; He helps his believing servants. It is known that fighting is prescribed so that the religion be only for God. Such a fighting cannot be started until the adversaries are first invited to come onto the right path, that is, the religion based upon monotheism.

Some people wrote that this verse was abrogated by the verse: *Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth, from among those who were given the Book, until they pay the jizyah*

(tributary tax) *with their hand while they are in a state of subjection* (9:29).

But there is no question of either verse abrogating the other, because they deal with different subjects. The verse under discussion is, as explained earlier, about the Meccan polytheists and does not cover the People of the Book who are referred to in verse 9:29. *And the religion be only for Allah* means that idol-worship be abolished and the Oneness of God be accepted. The people of the Book do believe in One Creator. We know their belief is in reality disbelief as God says that they: do not believe in God, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what God and His Messenger have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth. But Islam is content with their mere profession of monotheism. Fighting with them was ordained not to make them believe in monotheism, but simply so that they might pay tribute to the Muslims, thus raising the true creed above their creed and making Islam victorious over all religions.

… but if they desist then there should be no hostility except against the oppressors: If they desist from disbelief in what you believe in, then cease fighting with them, because there is no hostility except against the oppressors. In this verse also, the cause has been mentioned in place of the effect. Instead of saying "then cease fighting with them" it points out the cause that there should be no hostility except against the oppressors. It is like the verse: *But if they repent and establish the prayer and pay the zakāt, then they are your brethren in faith* (9:11).

الشَّهْرُ الْحَرَامُ بِالشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ وَالْحُرُمَاتُ قِصَاصٌ ۚ فَمَنِ اعْتَدَىٰ عَلَيْكُمْ فَاعْتَدُوا
عَلَيْهِ بِمِثْلِ مَا اعْتَدَىٰ عَلَيْكُمْ ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِينَ ﴿١٩٤﴾

(2:194) ***The sacred month for the sacred month and reprisal [is lawful] in all sacred things; whoever then acts aggressively against you, inflict the like aggression on him as he has inflicted on you, and fear Allah and know that Allah is with those who guard [against evil].***

ḥurumāt (sacred things) refers to the sanctity of the sacred month, the sanctity of the "boundary" (*ḥaram*) of Mecca, and the sanctity of the Sacred Mosque. If the Meccan polytheists disregard the sanctity of the sacred month by fighting in it—and they did violate its sanctity when they prevented the Prophet and his companions from pilgrimage (*ʿumrah*) in the years of Ḥudaybiyah (6 A.H.), and attacked them with arrows and stones—then the believers are allowed to fight them in that month and it

would not be deemed disrespectful towards it. The believers are fighting in the way of God and are obeying His Command to raise up His word. Likewise, if the infidels violate the sanctity of the boundary of Mecca or the Sacred Mosque by fighting in it or in that area then the believers may hit back at them in that place and that area.

The sacred month for the sacred month describes a particular example, followed by a general observation, and reprisal (is lawful) in all sacred things. This in its turn is followed by even more general principle, whoever then acts aggressively against you, inflict the like aggression on him as he has inflicted on you.

The meaning, thus, will be: God has sanctioned reprisal in the sacred month because He has sanctioned it for all sacred things. And He has sanctioned reprisal for all sacred things because He has made it lawful for His servants to inflict aggression equal to the aggression inflicted upon them.

Then He exhorts them to remain steadfastly cautious when inflicting aggression in reprisal, lest they trespass the limit. After all, punishing an oppressor seems sweet, and all animal instincts are roused when one is engaged in taking revenge. There are more chances of deviation from justice, by the use of excessive force, and by disregard of the limits put by the religion. But the fact has already been mentioned that God loves not those who exceed the limit. And the believers are most in need of the love of God, His patronage and His help. Therefore, they are told to fear God *and know that Allah is with those who guard [against evil]*.

The question arises: Why God sanctioned acting aggressively when He does not love those who act aggressively (or, as translated above, exceed the limit)? Of course, acting aggressively is to be condemned, but only when it is not in response to an aggression. But if it is his reprisal of an aggression, then it is not "exceeding the limit" or "acting aggressively." It is defending oneself from degradation, and liberating oneself from the fetters of slavery, oppression and injustice. It is like showing pride before a proud man, or the open utterance of evil in speech by the one who has been wronged.

وَأَنْفِقُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَلَا تُلْقُوا بِأَيْدِيكُمْ إِلَى التَّهْلُكَةِ وَأَحْسِنُوا ۛ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُحْسِنِينَ ﴿١٩٥﴾

(2:195) ***And spend in the way of Allah and cast not yourselves into***

perdition with your own hands; and do good; verily Allah loves those who do good.

It is the command to spend wealth for waging war in the way of God. The clause, in the way of God attached to "spending" has the same significance as when attached to "fighting" in 2:190. "With your hands" (*biaydīkum*); with (*b*…) here is extra, added for emphasis. The meaning is "and cast not your hands in perdition." The hand is a symbol of power, ability and strength; and the verse says: *do not nullify or waste your strength by not spending money in preparation for war*. Another interpretation: "with" (*b*…) signifies the cause or means; and the object of the verb is yourselves (*anfusakum*) which is deleted but understood. Accordingly, the meaning will be as translated above: *and cast not yourselves into perdition with your own hands*.

Tahlukah and *hilāk* are synonymous; both mean to perish, to fall in perdition. When man becomes in such a condition that he does not know where he is, this word is used. *Tahlukah* is with the paradigm of *taf*ᶜ*ulah*. There is no other infinitive verb in Arabic with this paradigm.

The order is, anyhow, general; and it prohibits any commission or omission which may cause perdition, whether it is on the side of excess or deficiency. For example, miserliness and avarice when preparing for war would weaken the fighters and make the army of Islam the target of the enemy; and many would be killed. On the other hand, extravagance in expenditure would bring poverty and misery to such a spender, degrade him in society and make life unbearable. Both these actions are prohibited by this verse.

God finished this talk on "doing good," and said: and do good; verily God loves the doers of good. Doing good does not mean desisting from fighting, or clemency in killing the enemies of the religion and so on. It means doing a work in its proper way: Fight when fighting is required; restrain yourselves when restraint is preferred; be strict where strictness is demanded by reason, and forgive where forgiveness will not embolden the enemy. In short, repulsing the oppressor by the most reasonable means is to do good for humanity, because this repulsion guarantees humanity its due right, and defends the religion which would improve man's condition in both worlds.

Further, desisting from exceeding the limits while obtaining the due right is another good action. And love of God is the final good of the

religion; and it is essential for every follower of religion to be worthy of the love of God by obeying His command and following His Messenger. God says in the Qur'an: *Say: if you love Allah then follow me, Allah will love you and forgive you your sins* (3:30).

These five verses—and they are about fighting—began with the prohibition of exceeding the limit and that: *Verily God loves not those who exceed the limit*, and ended with the command to do good and that: *Verily God loves those who do good*. Its delicacy and subtlety need no explanation.

The War as Ordained by the Qur'an

The Qur'an ordered the Muslims to desist from fighting and patiently bear all persecutions in the way of God. See, for example, the following verses: *Say: O unbelievers! I do not worship that which you worship, nor do you worship Him whom I worship; nor am I going to worship that which you worship; nor are you going to worship Him whom I worship. Unto you be your religion, and unto me my religion* (Ch. 109); *And bear patiently what they say* (73:10); *Have you not seen those to whom it was said: Withhold your hands and establish prayer and pay the poor-rate* (zakāt)*, but when fighting was prescribed for them …* (4:77).

This last verse (4:77) refers to the following: *Many of the people of the Book wish that they could turn you back into unbelievers after you had believed, out of envy on their part, [even] after the truth has become manifest unto them. But pardon and forgive [them] so that Allah should bring about His command. Verily, Allah is Powerful over all things. And establish prayer and give the poor-rate …* (2:109-110)

Then came the verses of fighting. Among them are the verses sanctioning fighting with the polytheists of Mecca and their allies: *Permission [to fight] is given to those upon whom war is made, for they have been oppressed, and surely Allah is able to help them; those who have been expelled from their homes without a just cause except that they say: Our Lord is Allah* (22:39-40).

These verses might have been revealed to allow the Muslims to defend themselves at Badr and so on: *And fight with them until there is no mischief [disbelief], and the religion be only for Allah; but if they desist, then verily Allah sees what they do. And if they turn back, then know that Allah is your Master; the Most Excellent Master and the Most Excellent Helper* (8:39-40); *And fight in the way of Allah with those who fight with you, and do not*

exceed the limit. Verily, Allah loves not those who exceed the limit (2:190).

And among them are the verses permitting fighting with the people of the Book: *Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth, from among those who were given the Book, until they pay the jizyah* [tributary tax] *with their hand while they are in a state of subjection* (9:29).

Also among them are the verses for fighting against the polytheists in general, and here, this word covers all unbelievers except the people of the Book: *Then slay the polytheists wherever you find them* (9:6); *And fight the polytheists all together as they fight you altogether* (9:36).

And finally there are the verses allowing the fight against the unbelievers in general: *Fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you and let them find in you hardiness* (9:123).

In short, the Qur'an says that Islam—the religion of monotheism—is based on the foundation of true nature, and is responsible for the well-being of humanity in this life. God says: *Then set your face uprightly for the [right] religion—the nature made by Allah in which He has made men; there is no alteration in the creation of Allah; that is the established religion, but most people do not know* (30:30).Therefore, establishing and maintaining this religion is the most important right for humanity which has been laid down. God says: *He has prescribed for you of the religion what He enjoined upon Noah and that which We have revealed unto you and that which we enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus, then establish the religion and be not divided therein* (42:13). And to defend this prescribed natural right is another natural right. God says: *And had there not been Allah's repelling some people by others, certainly would have been pulled down cloisters and churches and synagogues and mosques in which Allah's name is much remembered. And surely Allah will help him who helps Him* [that is, His cause], *most verily Allah is Strong, Mighty* (22:40). It is, thus, made clear that the religion of monotheism can stand on its feet and remain alive only if there is proper arrangement for its defence against enemies, as God says: *And were it not for Allah's repelling some men with others, the earth certainly would be in a state of disorder* (2:251). Also, He says in the Chapter 8 of al-Anfāl in the middle of the topic of fighting: *That He may establish the truth of what was true and bring to naught what was false, though the guilty ones disliked* (8:8). After some verses, He says: *O you*

who believe! Answer [the call of] Allah and His Messenger when he calls you to that which gives you life (8:24). Here the war and fighting, to which the believers are called, has been termed as something giving them life. It means that fighting—whether waged for the defence of the Muslims, or that of the Islamic territory or even that which is initiated—is in reality in defence of the right of humanity in this life. Polytheism is the death of humanity and, a corruption of nature, and it is the defence of its right that resurrects it and gives it a new lease of life.

An intelligent observer will realize at this juncture that Islam should have had a parallel defensive system to cleanse the earth from polytheism of every shade and to purify the faith of all those who believe in one Creator. After all, the fighting mentioned in the above verses has only two aims: Removing noticeable polytheism, that is idol-worship, and raising the word of truth above the creeds of the people of the Book by compelling them to pay *jizyah*. But it does not remove less noticeable polytheism; even the people of the Book are not true believers in One God. The same verse (9:29), which allows them to pay *jizyah*, declares that they do not believe in God or His Messenger and do not follow the religion of truth. Therefore, they are in reality polytheists even though they profess to believe in one God; their polytheism is hidden behind their declared monotheism. And if the Muslims were to defend the natural right of humanity, they should bring them into the fold of Islam—the true religion.

The Qur'an does not give such an order in clear words, but it promises them the final victory over their enemies; and the promised victory is of such a nature that it cannot be achieved with out waging this kind of war, a war to establish pure monotheistic belief. God says: *He it is Who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the religion of truth so that He may make it triumph over all the religions, though the polytheists may be averse* (61:9). And clearer than this is the verse, *And certainly, We did write in the Zabūr* [Psalms] *after the Reminder that the earth, shall inherit it my righteous servants* (21:105). Even far more clear is the verse, *Allah has promised unto those of you who believe and do good deeds that He will certainly make them successors in the earth as He made successors those before them, and that He will certainly establish for them their religion which He has chosen for them, and that He will certainly, after their fear, give them security in exchange; they shall worship Me, not associating aught with Me* (24:55). The words, *they shall worship Me* means sincere worship with the real faith, as

may be inferred by the following clause, *not associating aught with Me*. We should remember that, in the eyes of God, even some professed faith is in reality polytheism, as He says, *And most of them do not believe in Allah without associating others [with Him]* (12:106). So, it is the promise of God that He will cleanse the earth from every type of polytheism, and reserve it for the true believers, and then none shall be worshipped but God.

Perhaps someone may say: That promise is of divine help; God shall fulfil it through a divine reformer without using manifest means like war, and so on. But this objection cannot be upheld in view of the words, *He will certainly make them successors*. Successors clearly means that someone is removed from his place and another one is put therein. This implies war.

Also there is the following verse: *O you who believe! Whoever of you turns away from his religion, then soon Allah will bring a people that He will love them and they will love Him, humble before the believers and mighty against the unbelievers, they shall strive hard [shall fight] in the way of Allah and will not fear censure of any censurer* (5:54).

This verse (5:54) implies a call to the Truth and a religious movement which will happen by divine command; and it supports the view that this promise shall be fulfilled after the call of fighting in the way of God.

From the above, we may know the reply to a very common criticism of Islam. The Christian missionaries call it the religion of the sword and blood; some say that it is the religion of force and compulsion. All this, because Islam has sanctioned *jihād* (war in the way of God). They say that it is totally against the character of the religious movements of the previous prophets. The previous religions relied not on the sword but on persuasion and guidance.

The above is the gist of that criticism. But the Qur'an has explained that Islam is based on the judgement of true human nature. Humanity can only achieve its perfection if it accepts that judgement. And that nature has decreed that all individual and collective affairs should be governed by the laws which are based on the belief in one God. To defend this basic principle is a prescribed right of humanity. It can only be defended by spreading it among people and protecting it from disorder and destruction. And this right must be safeguarded by all possible means. Even then, moderation is the key-word in all this venture. It begins with the Call and patiently enduring the persecution by enemies. Then comes the defence of the lives of the Muslims and Islamic territory. Lastly comes the war started

by order of the divine representative to defend the above mentioned human right and protect the Creed of the Oneness of God. Whatever the type of fighting, it must be preceded by calling them to come to the right path, and that Call should be based on reason and understanding, as the Prophet used to do. God says: *Call unto the way of thy Lord with wisdom and kindly exhortation; and have disputation [discussion] with them in the manner which is the best* (16:125). This verse is unconditional. Also, God says: *That he who would perish might perish after a clear proof, and he who would live might live after a clear proof* (8:42).

There is no need to feel alarmed if *jihād* has in it an element of compulsion. When explanations, discussions and exhortations fail to bring a group of people onto the right path, and humanity is in disorder and turmoil because of that group's disregard for the basic right mentioned above, then there is no way but to compel them to come onto the right path of truth. This is the strategy adopted by all societies and states throughout the world. The outlaws who flout the laws of the state are first called to accept the authority of the state and obey its laws. Then, if they do not listen, they are compelled by all possible means to do so, even if it leads to killing and fighting.

A point to ponder: The compulsion will remain for one generation only. Coming generations will be so taught and trained that they will gladly accept the Religion of nature and the creed of the Oneness of God. It is not objectionable if one generation is compelled to see reason, if by that action all coming generations will gladly follow the right path till the end of the world.

The claim, that all the previous prophets adopted verbal persuasion as their only instrument of guidance, shows an ignorance of the facts. Most of the prophets had neither the opportunity nor the power to wage war. Read, for example, the lives of Noah, Hūd and Ṣāliḥ (peace be on them all); they were under pressure from their enemies on all sides. The same was the case with Jesus when he was among his people, trying to spread his call. His call did not spread until it was too late; it spread when the period of its validity was coming to its end, near the advent of Islam.

On the other hand, the Old Testament contains the lives of many prophets who waged war in the way of God. The Qur'an also mentions some of them. God says: *And how many a prophet fought with whom were myriads of Godly men; so they did not lose heart at what befell them in the*

way of Allah nor did they weaken nor did they abase themselves. And Allah loves the steadfast ones. And their saying was nothing but that they prayed, Our Lord! forgive us our sins, and our excesses in our affairs and make our feet firm and help us against the unbeliever people (3:146-147). And He says, among other matters, describing what happened when Moses called the Israelites to fight against the Palestinians: *And [remember] when Moses said unto his people: … O my people! Enter you the holy land which Allah has assigned for you; and turn not on your backs, for then you will return [as] losers … They said, O Moses! Verily we shall never enter it at all, while they remain therein. Go you and your Lord and fight you two, surely, we shall stay here sitting* (5:22-27). There is another story about the fighting of Saul and Goliath which begins with the words: *Have you not seen the chiefs of the children of Israel, after Moses, when they spoke to a prophet unto them [saying], raise up for us a king, so that we may fight in the way of Allah …* (2:246-251).

Then there is the story of the prophet Solomon and the queen of Sheba, in which Solomon writes to her: *That exalt not yourselves against me and come unto me in submission. After receiving her ambassador, he threatened him, return unto them; for we will certainly come to them with hosts which they shall have no power to resist, and we will certainly expel them out therefrom with abasement while they shall be in a state of ignominy* (27:20-44). See how Solomon called them unto right path; and when the result was not as he had expected, he threatened them to initiate a war.

From the Sociological Point of View

There is no doubt that every society—human beings as well as some animals—is based on the natural urge to save itself from extinction. Nature gave each species a right to make use of every thing which may help in keeping it alive. Man takes advantage of inorganic substances, plants, animals and even other human beings in every possible manner, even if it clashes with the rights of those animals or prevents organic and inorganic substances from reaching the point of their perfection. Likewise, animals make use of plants and other animals and their instinct tells them that they have a right to do so.

In the same way, nature gave them a right to defend the above right, because the right of use would not be complete without the right of defence. After all, it is an over-crowded place where every thing is in

continuous struggle for its survival. Every species which is endowed with sense and movement feels that it has a natural right to protect its rights, and is sure this defence is as lawful as the basic right itself. For proof, see how the animals defend themselves, when in conflict with others, with their armaments: horns, teeth, claws, hooves, stings, beaks, and so on. Those who are not gifted with such weapons protect themselves by fleeing or hiding or pretending to be dead. Others, like monkeys and foxes save themselves by cunning and deception.

Man has been given the power of thinking, by which he can employ other things for this defence. His nature issues commands and pronounces judgements. And one of those judgements is that man has a basic right of use and also a right to defend that basic right. It is this second right which prompts him to fight and quarrel on all occasions when he feels that his right is in danger.

The basic right of taking advantage of other things is bridled by the realization that it is not only he who wants to make use of others but others also want to exercise the same right over all others. These conflicting demands counterbalance each other and man is forced to come to terms with society and to realize that he also has to serve others as he wants others to serve him. This exchange of services has to be done on the scale fixed by the society.

It is clear from the above that the conflict and struggle to defend his rights is not based on the right to use other things, because this right of use was moderated and balanced by man himself as soon as he entered society; he had to agree that he would take advantage of others only according to the service which he himself was prepared to offer to others. As a result of this mutual understanding there was no place for fighting. Fighting is based on the second right, that is the right to defend his interests. Man believes that he has a right in some thing: when he sees that presumed right is endangered, he stands up to defend and protect it.

Thus all wars are in reality defensive. Even kings and emperors assume that they have a certain right, let us say the right to rule; they believe that they deserve to reign.

Others feel that the solution to increasing population or the economic difficulties of their country depends on the annexation of additional territories; and they believe that they have a right to do this. However absurd these pretexts may seem to others, the man who advances them

really believes in them. Once he, in his mind, gives that right to himself, he is ready to defend it, even if it means attacking others, shedding blood, creating disorder in the country and destroying land and people.

Thus the defence of the human rights is a right laid down in nature which a man is entitled to exercise. But the preceding paragraphs have made it clear that it is only a secondary right. The primary and basic right is the one of taking advantage of others.

If we have to decide whether a certain defensive action was proper, we should, first of all, see how important or proper the defended right was. We must be satisfied that the damage to society by our defensive action would not cancel or maybe even exceed the benefit of the defended right.

The Qur'an has established that the most important human right is the belief in the Oneness of God and the laws based on the divine revelation. Also, society unanimously believes that the most important was the right to live under such laws which protect the well-being of individuals.

As these two rights are the most important ones, their defence takes precedence over all other considerations.

Examining Narrations

(1) Ibn ʿAbbās said about the verse, *And fight in the way of Allah …*: "This verse was revealed about the treaty of Ḥudaybiyah. And it was like this: The Messenger of God and his companions came out in the year when they wanted to perform ʿ*umrah*. They were one thousand and four hundred persons. They proceeded till they reached Ḥudaybiyah. There the polytheists prevented them from reaching the Sacred House. Therefore, they slaughtered their sacrificial animals at Ḥudaybiyah. The polytheists made an agreement with them that they were to go back that year; they would return for ʿ*umrah* next year when they would be allowed to enter and remain in Mecca for three days to perform *ṭawāf* and whatever religious rites they wished.

"The (Messenger of God) thereon returned to Medina. Next year the Prophet and his companions made preparations for the ʿ*umrah* which had become *qaḍā* the previous year. At the same time, they were afraid that the Qurayshites would not honor the agreement and would again prevent them from reaching the Sacred House and would fight. The Messenger of God did not

like the idea of fighting with them in the Sacred month within the sacred boundary of Mecca. Then God sent down this verse." (*Majmaᶜ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: Similar traditions have been written in *al-Durr al-manthūr* with various chains from Ibn ᶜAbbās and others.

(2) Another tradition from al-Rabīᶜ b. Anas and ᶜAbdu al-Raḥmān b. Zayd b. Aslam said: This is the first verse revealed about fighting. When it was revealed, the Messenger of God used to fight with those who fought with him and desisted from fighting those who refrained from fighting, until was revealed the verses, Kill the polytheists wherever you find them. Thus the above verse was abrogated. (*Majmaᶜ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: It is their own opinion. You know that the verse: *Kill the polytheists wherever you find them* does not abrogate the verse *And fight in the way of Allah …* Rather it generalizes an order which was specific.

(3) About the verse, *and kill them wherever you find them …*: This verse was revealed because one of the companions killed an infidel in the sacred month. The believers condemned him for it. Then God made it clear that mischief in religion, that is, polytheism, is more grievous than killing polytheists in the sacred month, even though it was not allowed. (*Majmaᶜ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: You know that the singleness of the context and inter-relationship of all the five verses obviously proves that they were revealed all together, not piecemeal.

(4) There is a tradition from various chains, from Qatādah. He said: "And fight with them until there is no more mischief, that is, polytheism, and the religion be only for God." He said: "till it is said, 'there is none to be worshipped except God.' It is this cause which the Messenger of God fought for, and called the people to. And we are told that the Prophet used to say, 'Verily God ordered me to fight the people till they say, "there is none to be worshipped except God," then, if they desisted (from polytheism), there should be no hostility except against the oppressors." He said: "And verily the oppressor, who refuses to say 'there is none to be worshipped except God' shall be fought with till he says 'there is none to be worshipped except God.' " (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: The sentence "And verily the oppressor …" is the saying of Qatādah; he has inferred it from the saying of the Prophet and it is a fine inference.

A similar interpretation has been reported from ʿIkrimah.

(5) al-Bukhārī, Abu al-Shaykh and Ibn Mardawayh have narrated from Ibn ʿUmar that two persons came to him during the *fitnah* (mischief) of Ibn al-Zubayr and told him: "Verily, people have done (what they have done) and you are the son of ʿUmar and a companion of the Prophet; then why do you not come out?" He (Ibn ʿUmar) said: "It prevents me (from coming out) that God has forbidden (shedding) the blood of my (Muslim) brother." They said: "Has not God said, fight with them until there is no (more) mischief?" He said: "We fought until there was no more mischief and the religion became only of God; but you want to fight until there he mischief and the religion be for other than God." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: He was mistaken in the meaning of *fitnah* and also the two questioners were mistaken. The meaning of *fitnah* has already been explained. The event of Ibn al-Zubayr was not "polytheism or disbelief," it was an example of disorder on earth, or fighting with one another without any just cause; and believers were not allowed to remain silent about it.

(6) There is in *Majmaʿ al-bayān*, under the verse, *and fight with them until there is no [more] mischief*: "That is polytheism," and the author of *Majmaʿ al-bayān* said: "And it is narrated from Abū ʿAbdillāh."

(7) There is a hadith in the *Tafsīr* of al-ʿAyyāshī about the words of God: *The sacred month for the sacred month*; al-ʿUlāʾ b. al-Fuḍayl said: "I asked him (the Imam) whether it was allowed to the Muslims to start fighting with the polytheists in the sacred month. He said: 'If the polytheists start the fight with them by (practically) making it lawful (to fight in the month), then the Muslims will see how they can overcome the polytheists (and do it). And it is the word of God, *The sacred month for the sacred month and reprisal [is lawful] in all sacred things*.' "

(8) Aḥmad and Ibn Jarīr, and al-Naḥḥās in his *Nāsikh*, have narrated from Jābir b. ʿAbdullāh that he said: "The Messenger of God did

not fight in the sacred month until he was fought with, and if ever he was in a fight and the sacred month began, he would desist (from fighting) until it came to an end." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(9) Muʿāwīyah b. ʿAmmār said: "I asked Abū ʿAbdillāh about a man who killed another man, outside the sacred territory and then entered the sacred territory. The Imam said: 'He will not be killed (therein), but he will not be given anything to eat or drink, and will not be sold anything until he comes out of the sacred territory; then he will be given the punishment of his crime.' " The narrator said that he then asked the Imam: "Then what do you say about a man who killed someone in the sacred territory or stole therein. He (the Imam) said: 'He will be punished inside the sacred territory because he himself did not maintain respect of it. And God has said, *whoever then acts aggressively against you, inflict the like aggression on him*.' (The Imam said) 'This is the law about the sacred territory; and God said, there should be no hostility except against the aggressors.' " (*al-Kāfī*)

(10) Imam al-Ṣādiq said about the words of God, *and cast not yourselves into perdition*: "If a man spent in the way of God all that he had, he would not have done good and God would not lead him to success. Does God not say: *and cast not yourselves into perdition with your own hands; and do good*; Verily God loves those who do good, that is, who are economical." (*ibid*.)

(11) al-Ṣadūq has narrated from Thābit b. Anas that he said: "The Messenger of God said: 'Obedience to the ruler is obligatory; and one who has left the obedience to the ruler has not obeyed God and has entered into His prohibition, as He says: and cast not yourselves into perdition with your own hands.' "

(12) It is narrated in *al-Durr al-manthūr* with numerous chains, from Aslam Abī ʿImrān that he said: "We were (fighting) at Constantinople; ʿAqbah b. ʿĀmir commanded the Egyptians, and Fuḍālah b. ʿUbayd led the Syrians. There came out a big row of the Romans, and we stood in row against them. Then a man from our side attacked the Roman row until he entered in its midst. The people (Muslims) cried out, 'Glory be to God! He is casting himself in perdition with his own hands!' Then Abū Ayyūb, the companion of the Messenger of God, stood up and said: 'O

people! You are interpreting this verse in this way, while (the fact is that) it was sent down about us, the group of the Helpers. Verily, when God made His religion powerful, and its helpers increased in number, some of us told others, keeping it secret from the Messenger of God, "Verily, our properties are ruined, and (now) God had made Islam powerful and its helpers have increased. Therefore, (it would be better) if we stayed in our properties and mended what had been damaged therein." Then God revealed to his prophet, refuting what we had said, And spend in the way of God and cast not yourselves into perdition with your own hands. So, perdition meant our staying in our properties and repairing them by leaving fighting (in the way of God).' "

Author's comment: The difference of the traditions in interpreting the meaning of this verse supports what we have said that this verse is general and covers both extremes (extravagance and miserliness) in spending, and that it is not confined to spending only, but covers other aspects also where "casting oneself into perdition" can be applied.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verses 196-203

وَأَتِمُّوا الْحَجَّ وَالْعُمْرَةَ لِلَّهِ ۚ فَإِنْ أُحْصِرْتُمْ فَمَا اسْتَيْسَرَ مِنَ الْهَدْيِ ۖ وَلَا تَحْلِقُوا
رُءُوسَكُمْ حَتَّىٰ يَبْلُغَ الْهَدْيُ مَحِلَّهُ ۚ فَمَنْ كَانَ مِنْكُمْ مَرِيضًا أَوْ بِهِ أَذًى مِنْ
رَأْسِهِ فَفِدْيَةٌ مِنْ صِيَامٍ أَوْ صَدَقَةٍ أَوْ نُسُكٍ ۚ فَإِذَا أَمِنْتُمْ فَمَنْ تَمَتَّعَ بِالْعُمْرَةِ إِلَى
الْحَجِّ فَمَا اسْتَيْسَرَ مِنَ الْهَدْيِ ۚ فَمَنْ لَمْ يَجِدْ فَصِيَامُ ثَلَاثَةِ أَيَّامٍ فِي الْحَجِّ وَسَبْعَةٍ
إِذَا رَجَعْتُمْ ۗ تِلْكَ عَشَرَةٌ كَامِلَةٌ ۗ ذَٰلِكَ لِمَنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ أَهْلُهُ حَاضِرِي الْمَسْجِدِ
الْحَرَامِ ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ ﴿١٩٦﴾ الْحَجُّ أَشْهُرٌ مَعْلُومَاتٌ ۚ
فَمَنْ فَرَضَ فِيهِنَّ الْحَجَّ فَلَا رَفَثَ وَلَا فُسُوقَ وَلَا جِدَالَ فِي الْحَجِّ ۗ وَمَا تَفْعَلُوا مِنْ
خَيْرٍ يَعْلَمْهُ اللَّهُ ۗ وَتَزَوَّدُوا فَإِنَّ خَيْرَ الزَّادِ التَّقْوَىٰ ۚ وَاتَّقُونِ يَا أُولِي الْأَلْبَابِ ﴿١٩٧﴾
لَيْسَ عَلَيْكُمْ جُنَاحٌ أَنْ تَبْتَغُوا فَضْلًا مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ ۚ فَإِذَا أَفَضْتُمْ مِنْ عَرَفَاتٍ
فَاذْكُرُوا اللَّهَ عِنْدَ الْمَشْعَرِ الْحَرَامِ ۖ وَاذْكُرُوهُ كَمَا هَدَاكُمْ وَإِنْ كُنْتُمْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ
لَمِنَ الضَّالِّينَ ﴿١٩٨﴾ ثُمَّ أَفِيضُوا مِنْ حَيْثُ أَفَاضَ النَّاسُ وَاسْتَغْفِرُوا اللَّهَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ
غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ ﴿١٩٩﴾ فَإِذَا قَضَيْتُمْ مَنَاسِكَكُمْ فَاذْكُرُوا اللَّهَ كَذِكْرِكُمْ آبَاءَكُمْ أَوْ
أَشَدَّ ذِكْرًا ۗ فَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَقُولُ رَبَّنَا آتِنَا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَمَا لَهُ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنْ خَلَاقٍ
﴿٢٠٠﴾ وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَقُولُ رَبَّنَا آتِنَا فِي الدُّنْيَا حَسَنَةً وَفِي الْآخِرَةِ حَسَنَةً وَقِنَا عَذَابَ
النَّارِ ﴿٢٠١﴾ أُولَٰئِكَ لَهُمْ نَصِيبٌ مِمَّا كَسَبُوا ۚ وَاللَّهُ سَرِيعُ الْحِسَابِ ﴿٢٠٢﴾ وَاذْكُرُوا اللَّهَ
فِي أَيَّامٍ مَعْدُودَاتٍ ۚ فَمَنْ تَعَجَّلَ فِي يَوْمَيْنِ فَلَا إِثْمَ عَلَيْهِ وَمَنْ تَأَخَّرَ فَلَا إِثْمَ

عَلَيْهِ ۚ لِمَنِ اتَّقَىٰ ۗ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّكُمْ إِلَيْهِ تُحْشَرُونَ ﴿٢٠٣﴾

(2:196) *And complete the ḥajj [pilgrimage] and ʿumrah for Allah, but if you be prevented, then [send] whatever offering [sacrificial animal] is easy to obtain, and do not Shave your heads until the offering reaches its destination; but whoever among you is sick or has an affliction in his head, then [he should effect] a redemption by fasting, or alms, or sacrifice. But when you are secure [from the hindrance] then whoever enjoys by the ʿumrah for the ḥajj, [he should offer] whatever offering [sacrificial animal] is easy to obtain; but he who cannot find [any offering] should fast for three days during the ḥajj [pilgrimage] and for seven days when you return; these [make] ten [days] perfect; this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque; and fear Allah and know that Allah is severe in requiting [evil].*

(2:197) *Ḥajj is the months well-known; so whoever determines [to perform] the ḥajj therein, then there shall be no sexual intercourse, nor bad language, nor quarrelling during the ḥajj; and whatever good you do, Allah knows it; and make provision, for surely the best provision is piety [guarding oneself against evil]; and fear Me, O people of understanding!*

(2:198) *There is no blame on you if you seek bounty from your Lord; then when you march from ʿArafāt, remember Allah near the Holy Monument, and remember Him as He has guided you, although before this you were surely of those who had gone astray.*

(2:199) *Then march on from whence the people march on, and ask for the forgiveness of Allah; verily, Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.*

(2:200) *So, when you have performed your rites, then remember Allah as you remember your fathers, rather a more Intense remembrance. For, of men there is he who says, Our Lord! give us in this world, and for him there shall be no portion in the Hereafter.*

(2:201) *And among them there is he who says, Our Lord! give us good in this world and good in the Hereafter and save us from the chastisement of the Fire.*

(2:202) *They shall have [their] portion of what they have earned; and Allah is quick in reckoning.*

(2:203) *And remember Allah during the counted number of days; then*

whoever hastens off in two days, there is no sin on him, and whoever tarries [there] there is no sin on him; [this is] for him who guards [himself]; and fear Allah, and know that you [all] shall be gathered together unto Him.

Introduction

almizan.org

These verses were revealed during the last pilgrimage (*ḥajjat al-widāʿ*) performed by the Messenger of God. They promulgated the pilgrimage of enjoyment (*ḥajj al-tamattuʿ*)

Commentary

وَأَتِمُّوا الْحَجَّ وَالْعُمْرَةَ لِلَّهِ ۚ فَإِنْ أُحْصِرْتُمْ فَمَا اسْتَيْسَرَ مِنَ الْهَدْيِ ۖ وَلَا تَحْلِقُوا رُءُوسَكُمْ حَتَّىٰ يَبْلُغَ الْهَدْيُ مَحِلَّهُ ۚ فَمَنْ كَانَ مِنْكُمْ مَرِيضًا أَوْ بِهِ أَذًى مِنْ رَأْسِهِ فَفِدْيَةٌ مِنْ صِيَامٍ أَوْ صَدَقَةٍ أَوْ نُسُكٍ ۚ فَإِذَا أَمِنْتُمْ فَمَنْ تَمَتَّعَ بِالْعُمْرَةِ إِلَى الْحَجِّ فَمَا اسْتَيْسَرَ مِنَ الْهَدْيِ ۚ فَمَنْ لَمْ يَجِدْ فَصِيَامُ ثَلَاثَةِ أَيَّامٍ فِي الْحَجِّ وَسَبْعَةٍ إِذَا رَجَعْتُمْ ۗ تِلْكَ عَشَرَةٌ كَامِلَةٌ ۗ ذَٰلِكَ لِمَنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ أَهْلُهُ حَاضِرِي الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ ﴿١٩٦﴾

(2:196) ***And complete the ḥajj [pilgrimage] and ʿumrah for Allah, but if you be prevented, then [send] whatever offering [sacrificial animal] is easy to obtain, and do not shave your heads until the offering reaches its destination; but whoever among you is sick or has an affliction in his head, then [he should effect] a redemption by fasting, or alms, or sacrifice. But when you are secure [from the hindrance] then whoever enjoys by the ʿumrah for the ḥajj, [he should offer] whatever offering [sacrificial animal] is easy to obtain; but he who cannot find [any offering] should fast for three days during the ḥajj [pilgrimage] and for seven days when you return; these [make] ten [days] perfect; this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque; and fear Allah and know that Allah is severe in requiting [evil].***

Completeness (*tamām*) of a thing is the final part, when added to the other parts it makes that thing whole, the thing becomes itself; and then

the expected effects follow. When a thing is started and some of its parts are assembled and then the final part is added, it is called *itmām* (completion, to complete). Perfection (*kamāl*) is a condition, virtue or characteristic which creates such an effect in a complete thing which would not be found in it without that perfection. When a human foetus receives all its limbs and organs, it is its completion. When he is called knowledgeable, courageous or chaste it is his perfection.

Sometimes, completion (*tamām*) is used metaphorically in place of perfection (*kamāl*) to show the extreme importance of that virtue or characteristic; the speaker implies that that virtue or is not something extra or external, it is an integral part without which the thing would remain incomplete.

In this verse, the completion of hajj and ʿ*umrah* has been used in the first (literal) sense; and it is proved by the following sentence, but if you be prevented. Obviously, this means prevented 'from carrying on the hajj and ʿ*umrah* to their last rite'; in other words, 'from completing them.' It cannot mean 'prevented from perfecting them.'

Hajj is a well-known Islamic act of worship, started by the Prophet Abraham. It continued among the Arabs, and God promulgated it for this *ummah* as a law which would continue up to the Day of Resurrection.

This action begins with *iḥrām* and the stay in ʿArafāt and then in the Sacred Monument. The pilgrims sacrifice an animal each at Mina, throw stones on the three Stone-pillars, circumambulate around the Kaʿbah, pray, and march between the Ṣafā and the Marwah. There are some other obligations as well.

Hajj is of three kinds: *ḥajj al-ifrād, ḥajju al-qirān* and *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ*. This last one was ordained in the last days of the Messenger of God.

ʿ*Umrah* is another act of worship. In ʿ*umrah*, the pilgrims visit the House of God after putting on *iḥrām* from one of the appointed places. Then they go round the Kaʿbah, pray, and march between the Ṣafā and the Marwah and finally cut off some nails or hair.

Hajj and ʿ*umrah* are acts of worship and cannot be complete except when they are done for the sake of God, as is seen in the sentence: *And complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah for Allah.*

… but if you be prevented, then [send] whatever offering [sacrificial animal] is easy to obtain, and do not shave your heads until the offering reaches its destination: *Iḥṣār* means to prevent, to obstruct. The verse

refers to being prevented from completing the hajj or ʿ*umrah*, after *iḥrām*, because of an ailment or enemy. *Istīsār* of a thing means its becoming easy, not difficult; this paradigm implies that, that thing acquires easiness for itself. *Hady* means the animal presented by one man to another or to a place, to seek someone's pleasure with it. It is derived from *hadyah* (gift, present); or from *hudā* (to lead to destination). It is used in both masculine and feminine forms, *hady* and *hadyah* like *tamr* and *tamrah* (date). Here it means the animals brought or led by the pilgrims for sacrifice during the hajj.

… but whoever among you is sick or has an affliction in his head, then [he should effect] a redemption by fasting, or alms, or sacrifice: This sentence is an offshoot of the preceding one, *do not shave your heads …* It implies that the sickness refers to only that one in which the man would suffer if his head were not shaved.

… or has an affliction in his head: The conjunctive "or" shows that the affliction here means a suffering other than sickness, like vermin. It figuratively means to be afflicted with vermin, example, lice. These two things (sickness and lice) make it lawful to shave the head; but a redemption should be effected by any of the three ways: fast, alms or sacrifice.

It is narrated in a tradition that the fast is for three days; the alms are to feed six poor persons, and the sacrifice is one goat.

But when you are secure [from the hindrance] then whoever enjoys by the ʿumrah for the ḥajj: It is an offshoot of the sentence: *if you be prevented*. The meaning is: When you are safe from all hindrances like sickness, an enemy or other such things, *then whoever enjoys by ʿumrah for the ḥajj*—that is, enjoys because of ʿ*umrah*. How does one enjoy because of ʿ*umrah*? It is because ʿ*umrah* is completed and the restrictions of *iḥrām* are lifted until the time comes to wear *iḥrām* again for hajj. Therefore, "by" (*bi*) in by ʿ*umrah* (*bi al-ʿumrah*) is causative. How does ʿ*umrah* cause enjoyment? It is because when ʿ*umrah* is completed, the restrictions of *iḥrām* like women, perfume, and so on, are lifted, and one may enjoy them till the time comes for the *iḥrām* of hajj.

… [he should offer] whatever offering is easy to obtain: Obviously, the sacrifice of the animal is an independent rite. It is not a substitute to make up for not wearing *iḥrām* of hajj from an appointed place; as it puts uncalled for strain on the mind to infer such a meaning from this verse.

Someone might say: (he should offer) *whatever offering is easy to obtain*

is based on: *then whoever enjoys by the ʿumrah*, just as an effect is based on its condition. In other words, the offering of the sacrifice is prescribed because of the enjoyment. Moreover, the word enjoyment mentioned in the conditional clause hints that the sacrifice is a recompense of that enjoyment which was allowed to lighten the burden and hardship of pilgrims, and the sacrifice compensates for it.

Author's comment: The above argument is refuted by the phrase, *by the ʿumrah*, that is, because the enjoyment is allowed after the *ʿumrah* comes to its end. The argument of lightening the burden could be advanced only if the enjoyments were allowed during the *ʿumrah*. But how can the words lightening the burden be used in this case when the *ʿumrah* is already completed and the restrictions of *ʿumrah* terminated; and when the *iḥrām* of hajj is yet to start?

And if there is any hint, it is only that the sacrificing of the animal has been prescribed because of the ordination of enjoyment by the *ʿumrah* for the hajj. There is no hint whatsoever in it that the sacrifice is to compensate for not doing *iḥrām* of hajj from the appointed place (*mīqāt*) outside Mecca.

Apparently the verse, *then whoever enjoys by the ʿumrah for the ḥajj,* (he should offer) *whatever offering is easy to obtain*, mentions *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ* as an already prescribed act of worship. It is not the original and initial ordination. It mentions enjoyment (*tamattuʿ*) as an established fact and then, on the basis of it, prescribes the sacrifice of the animal. It says, whosoever performs *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ*, shall offer a sacrifice. It does not say, "performs *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ* and offer a sacrifice." The original and initial prescription of *tamattuʿ* comes in the verse which comes later, this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque.

… but he who cannot find [any offering] should fast for three days during the ḥajj and for seven days when you return: Ḥajj is mentioned as the time of the fast because the time and place of both are the same. The time of hajj—from the *iḥrām* of hajj to the returning from it—is the very time of the three days' fast. There are traditions from the imams of Ahl al-Bayt that the time of this fast is before the Day of Sacrifice (10th Dhu al-ḥijjah) or, if one could not fast at that time then, after the 13th of Dhu al-ḥijjah, or, as a last alternative, at the time of returning to one's home.

The time of the seven-day fast is after returning to one's home, as is clear from the words, *when you return*. It should be noted that God did not

say, "at the time of returning." Moreover, the change of pronoun from the (previously used) third person to the second person in *when you return* is a hint that the hearer is now present—at home.

… these [make] ten [days] perfect: Three and seven together make ten perfect days. The seven days make perfect the previous three days; they do not complete it. The difference between perfection and completion has been explained in the beginning of the verse; and it means that both groups of three and seven days have separate identities with separate rules. The fast of three days is a complete act in itself; it depends on the fast of seven days for its perfection, not completion.

… this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque: This order of enjoying by the *ʿumrah* for the hajj is for the non-resident, that is, the person who dwells not less than twelve miles away from the Sacred Mosque. His family (*ahluh*) here means his dependents, like his wife and children. The non-resident has been described as he whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque. It is a very fine way of expression as it not only promulgates the law but explains its reason also; and that reason is to lighten the burden. The pilgrims who come from far off places for the hajj have to undergo all kinds of troubles, hardships and difficulties during the journey; and when they reach Mecca, they are tired and worn out. They naturally need a place to rest and recuperate. Usually, one gets this rest with his family, but here is a pilgrim whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque. Therefore, God ordained for him enjoyment (*tamattuʿ*); he may enjoy himself after completing the *ʿumrah* up to the time of hajj and then may raise his voice in *talbiyah*, that is, he may wear the *iḥrām* of hajj from the Sacred Mosque without going back to an appointed place for that purpose.

It has been explained earlier that it is this sentence that promulgates *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ*; it is a general ordinance, and is not limited to a particular time, or to a particular person, or to a particular situation. It is for all the non-resident pilgrims, for all times, and for all situations.

… and fear Allah and know that Allah is severe in requiting: This extreme severity in this humiliating way shows that there was a likelihood of the audience rejecting this order or hesitating to follow it. And this is what actually happened. Of all the laws of Islam, hajj had already been practised by the Arabs since the days of Abraham and all its rites were well-known to, and performed by, them. They were used to those rites, and

when Islam came, it let it be, as it was, until the last days of the Prophet's life. Therefore, it was not an easy thing to make any change in its method; they were not expected to accept any change in it willingly. That is why they protested against the law of enjoyment by *ʿumrah* and, as the traditions show, many of them did not welcome that order. So much so that the Prophet felt a pressing need to deliver a lecture telling them that the authority was from God only, He ordains as He wishes, and that it was a general order, nobody was exempted from it—neither the Prophet nor the *ummah*. This explains why the verse ended on such a harsh note, ordering them to fear God and threatening them with the chastisement of God.

الْحَجُّ أَشْهُرٌ مَعْلُومَاتٌ ۚ فَمَنْ فَرَضَ فِيهِنَّ الْحَجَّ فَلَا رَفَثَ وَلَا فُسُوقَ وَلَا جِدَالَ فِي الْحَجِّ ۗ وَمَا تَفْعَلُوا مِنْ خَيْرٍ يَعْلَمْهُ اللَّهُ ۗ وَتَزَوَّدُوا فَإِنَّ خَيْرَ الزَّادِ التَّقْوَىٰ ۚ وَاتَّقُونِ يَا أُولِي الْأَلْبَابِ ﴿١٩٧﴾

(2:197) ***Ḥajj is the months well-known; so whoever determines [to perform] the ḥajj therein, then there shall be no sexual intercourse, nor bad language, nor quarrelling during the ḥajj; and whatever good you do, Allah knows it; and make provision, for surely the best provision is piety [guarding oneself against evil]; and fear Me, O people of understanding!***

Hajj at the beginning of the verse means "the time of hajj." "Well-known," that is, to the Muslims; and the *sunnah* has explained it as Shawwāl, Dhu al-qaʿdah and Dhu al-ḥijjah. So far as Dhu al-ḥijjah is concerned, it is only about a half of the month which is the time of hajj; but there is no objection to counting it as one of the "months" of hajj.

We say: "The time of our reaching Mecca is Friday." But we reach there at a certain hour and minute, not during the whole day.

The noun *ḥajj* has been repeated three times in this verse. Why was the pronoun not used, which could have shortened the sentence? The fact is that the sentence has been shortened by using the noun instead of the pronouns: *ḥajj is the months …* means "the time of hajj"; *whoever determines the ḥajj* means the action itself; *nor quarrelling during the ḥajj* refers to "the duration and place of hajj." If the noun had not been repeated, it would have been necessary to lengthen the sentence to make the meaning clear.

… so whoever determines [to perform] the ḥajj therein, then there shall be no sexual intercourse, nor bad language, nor quarrelling during the

ḥajj: *faraḍa fi hinn al-ḥajj* literally means 'makes hajj obligatory therein'; and it implies, "makes hajj obligatory for himself by beginning its rites," because God says, *And complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah for Allah*. Therefore, once one starts the hajj, it is obligatory on one to complete it.

Rafath as mentioned in an earlier verse, literally means to say clearly such words which are generally unmentionable: *fusūq* means "disobedience" and *jidāl* is "disputation in the talk." But *sunnah* has explained that in this verse *rafath* means sexual intercourse; *fusūq* is lie; and *jidāl* is swearing by the name of God—'No, by God,' 'Yes, by God.'

… and whatever you do, Allah knows it: It is a reminder that one's actions are not hidden from God; it calls one to piety and fear of God, so that one's acts of worship might not be devoid of the spirit of devotion; so that one might not go through the external rites of worship with one's mind absent and one's heart forgetful. This is, generally, the style of the Qur'an in all subjects. You will find it explaining the fundamentals of the faith, narrating the stories of previous peoples, or promulgating laws; but whatever the subject, it is invariably followed by a lesson and an admonition so that knowledge is not without practice. Knowledge without practice has no value in Islam. That is why this exhortation to piety and fear of God was immediately followed by the words, *and fear Me, O people of understanding*. In the preceding sentence the name of God was mentioned in the third person (*Allah knows it*) but immediately it is changed to the first person (*fear Me*)—it is to show the utmost importance of piety, and to imply that the pious person has not reached nearer to God and is now directly addressed by Him.

لَيْسَ عَلَيْكُمْ جُنَاحٌ أَنْ تَبْتَغُوا فَضْلًا مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ ۚ فَإِذَا أَفَضْتُمْ مِنْ عَرَفَاتٍ
فَاذْكُرُوا اللَّهَ عِنْدَ الْمَشْعَرِ الْحَرَامِ ۖ وَاذْكُرُوهُ كَمَا هَدَاكُمْ وَإِنْ كُنْتُمْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ
لَمِنَ الضَّالِّينَ ﴿١٩٨﴾

(2:198) ***There is no blame on you if you seek bounty from your Lord; then when you march from ʿArafāt, remember Allah near the Holy Monument, and remember Him as He has guided you, although before this you were surely of those who had gone astray:***

It is like the words of God: *O you who believe! when the call is made for prayer on Friday, then hasten to the remembrance of Allah and leave*

off trading … And when the prayer is ended then disperse in the land and seek of the grace of Allah … (62:9-10). The trading of the first verse was changed to the seeking of bounty of God in the next one, showing that both are the same. That is why the *sunnah* has interpreted the words, *seek the bounty of Allah* in the verse under discussion as "the trading." This verse proves that trading during the pilgrimage is lawful.

… then when you march from ʿArafāt, remember Allah near to the Holy Monument: *ifāḍah* means going out from a place in a group. This verse, therefore, describes the stay at ʿArafāt as well as the stay at the Sacred Monument, that is, *al-muzdalafah*.

… and remember Him as He has guided you, although before this you were surely of those who had gone astray: Remember Him intensely enough to be like His guidance to you, although before His guidance you were surely of those who had gone astray.

ثُمَّ أَفِيضُوا مِنْ حَيْثُ أَفَاضَ النَّاسُ وَاسْتَغْفِرُوا اللَّهَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ ﴿١٩٩﴾

(2:199) ***Then march on from whence the people march on, and ask for the forgiveness of Allah; verily, Allah is Forgiving, Merciful:***

The verse makes it compulsory to march on as "the people" were doing, and obliges the immediate audience to follow "the people." This supports the reports that the Qurayshites and their allies (together known as *ḥums*) did not stay at ʿArafāt; instead they went direct to *al-muzdalafah* and stayed therein, claiming that they were the people of the sacred territory of God and, therefore, they would not leave that boundary. God, therefore, ordered them to march on (to *al-muzdalafah*) from whence the other people march on, that is, from ʿArafāt. In other words, the Qurayshites also must stay at ʿArafāt and then march on from there with others.

That being the case, why did God mention this order after the order to march from ʿArafāt, and begin it with then (*thumma*)? This sentence has been figuratively written as a sort of *istidrāk* (to catch up what had escaped. The meaning thus, will be: "The rules of hajj are as mentioned above, except that you are obliged to stay at, and march on from, ʿArafāt, not *al-muzdalafah*."

فَإِذَا قَضَيْتُمْ مَنَاسِكَكُمْ فَاذْكُرُوا اللَّهَ كَذِكْرِكُمْ آبَاءَكُمْ أَوْ أَشَدَّ ذِكْرًا ۗ فَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَقُولُ رَبَّنَا آتِنَا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَمَا لَهُ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنْ خَلَاقٍ ﴿٢٠٠﴾

(2:200) ***So, when you have performed your rites, then remember Allah as you remember your fathers, rather a more intense remembrance. For, of men there is he who says, Our Lord! give us in this world, and for him there shall be no portion in the Hereafter:***

It is a call to remember God with utmost intensity. The pilgrim should remember Him as he remembers his forefathers, or even more intensely. The grace of God on him (that is, the grace of guidance, as He mentioned it just above, *remember Him as He has guided you*) is far greater than the right of his forefathers upon him.

It has been said that the Arabs, in the days of ignorance, used to stay at Mina after the rites of hajj to boast vainly about their forefathers, in lectures and poetry. God by this verse changed it to His own remembrance.

Aw (or) in *aw ashadda dhikran* (or a more intense remembrance) is used in the meaning of "rather." The remembrance should be "tense." Remembrance may be intense (in quality) or frequent (in quantity). See, for example, the following verses where the adjective of quantity *kathīran* (much, frequently) has been used: *remember Allah, remembering frequently* (33:35); *and the men who remember Allah much* (33:35). Remembrance of God, in reality, is not by words alone. It is a thing concerned with the heart and mind; words are merely a demonstration of that feeling. Therefore, it may be described as frequent (in quantity), if one remembers God most of the time, as the Qur'an says: *Those who remember Allah standing and sitting and reclining on their sides …* (3:191). And it may be described as intense (in quality) at some other times. As remembrance was ordered for a time (*when you have finished your rites*) when one is liable to divert one's attention from God and forget Him, it was appropriate to use the adjective "more intense" rather than "more frequent."

For, of men there is he who says, Our Lord! give us in this world, and for him there shall be no portion in the Hereafter: It is based on the sentence: *then remember Allah as you remember your fathers, rather a more intense remembrance*. *Nās* (men, people) is general; it describes all human beings, the unbelievers as well as the believer—the unbelievers who only remembers his forefathers. In other words, he only wants the vain-glories of this world, only seeks material greatness, and has no concern with the Hereafter. And there is the believer who only seeks the pleasure of God, and even when he wants something from this world, he wants only that which his Lord is pleased to bestow upon him.

In view of above explanations, it is clear that the word "says" in both places does not mean asking or saying in so many words. It means 'wanting' by one's state and inner feeling. Thus, the verses mean that some people do not "want" anything except this world, and they shall have no portion in the Hereafter; and there are others who do not seek anything except what God is pleased to give them whether it be in this world or in the Hereafter; and they shall have their portion in the Hereafter.

وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَقُولُ رَبَّنَا آتِنَا فِي الدُّنْيَا حَسَنَةً وَفِي الْآخِرَةِ حَسَنَةً وَقِنَا عَذَابَ النَّارِ ﴿٢٠١﴾

(2:201) ***And among them there is he who says: Our Lord! give us good in this world and good in the Hereafter and save us from the chastisement of the Fire:***

Good (*ḥasanah*) is mentioned in the saying of the believers but not in that of the unbelievers. It is no secret that the one who wants this world, does not care whether it is good in the eyes of God or not. The whole world is sweet and good, in his thinking, if it satisfies his desire and if he can enjoy it. It is diametrically opposed to the thinking of the believer who wants the Hereafter. As the Hereafter will be either good or bad, he only wants and only asks for, the good, and not the bad.

أُولَٰئِكَ لَهُمْ نَصِيبٌ مِمَّا كَسَبُوا ۚ وَاللَّهُ سَرِيعُ الْحِسَابِ ﴿٢٠٢﴾

(2:202) ***They shall have [their] portion of what they have earned; and Allah is quick in reckoning.***

The contrast between the sentences, *and for him there shall be no portion in the Hereafter* (in verse 2:200) and *they shall have [their] portion of what they have earned* (in the verse under discussion), shows that the deeds of the first groups (but not of the second) shall be void and forfeited. God has said; *And We will proceed to what they have done of deeds, so We shall render them like dust scattered in air,* (25:23); *And on the day when those who disbelieve shall be brought before the fire: You did away with your good things in your life of the world and you took your fill of pleasure in them …* (46:20); *so their deeds become void and We will not assign to them any weight on the Day of Resurrection* (18:105).

… and Allah is quick in reckoning: *sariᶜ al-ḥisāb* (quick of reckoning)

is one of the names of God. Its generality suggests that it covers this world as well as the Hereafter. Even now the reckoning is in progress; whenever a man does any good or bad deed, God gives him its full recompense.

In short, the purpose of these two verses (201 & 202) is to exhort people to remember God. Men are of two types: Some want this world, and do not know or remember anything else; such persons have no portion in the Hereafter. And there are others who want what God is pleased to give them; they shall have their share in the Hereafter; and God is quick in reckoning—He quickly reckons what His servant wants, and recompenses him according to his wish. Therefore, you should remember God so that you may be among those who will get their portion in the Hereafter; do not join that group which does not remember God and, therefore, will have no portion. Otherwise, you will be disappointed on that day.

وَاذْكُرُوا اللَّهَ فِي أَيَّامٍ مَعْدُودَاتٍ ۚ فَمَنْ تَعَجَّلَ فِي يَوْمَيْنِ فَلَا إِثْمَ عَلَيْهِ وَمَنْ تَأَخَّرَ فَلَا إِثْمَ عَلَيْهِ ۚ لِمَنِ اتَّقَىٰ ۗ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّكُمْ إِلَيْهِ تُحْشَرُونَ ﴿٢٠٣﴾

(2:203) ***And remember Allah during the counted number of days; then whoever hastens off in two days, there is no sin on him, and whoever tarries [there] there is no sin on him; [this is] for him who guards [himself]; and fear Allah, and know that you [all] shall be gathered together unto Him:***

The counted days are the days of brightness, that is, the 11th, 12th and 13th of Dhu al-ḥijjah. The proof that these counted days are after the 10th of Dhu al-ḥijjah is that this order has been given when all the rites of hajj have already been mentioned. The proof that they are three days may be found in the next sentence, then whoever hastens off in two days. One may "hasten off" in two days only when the original number of days is three.

And the traditions also have interpreted it in the same way.

… then whoever hastens off in two days, there is no sin on him, and whoever tarries [there] there is no sin on him; [this is] for him who guards [himself]: No (*lā*) here is for negation of a genus. There is no sin on him (*lā ithmaʿalayh*) mentioned in the two sentences means that the pilgrim is free from the genus of sin, that is, from all sin. Had God meant to say that there would be no sin on the pilgrim in hastening off or in tarrying therein, the sentences would have contained some words to show it; but they are unconditional. Therefore, the verse means that the pilgrim who

performs the rites of hajj is forgiven all his sins, there remains no sin on him whether he hastens off in two days or tarries therein.

It appears from the above that the aim of this verse is not to show that the pilgrim has an option between hastening off and tarrying; its purpose is to declare that all the sins of the pilgrim are forgiven in either case.

The words: *[this is] for him who guards [himself]*, are not related to the forgiveness of sins; otherwise it would have been "on him who guards (himself)," not "for him." Apparently it is like a previous sentence, this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque. As that sentence pointed to the group which shall be governed by the law of enjoying by ʿ*umrah*, likewise, the words, for him who guards, specify those who have the option of hastening off or tarrying therein. This option is for him who guards himself; if someone did not guard himself, then it is not for him. It follows that the guarding here is confined to guarding against those things which God has forbidden during hajj. In other words, the meaning is this: This choice is given to him who guards himself from the things forbidden during the *iḥrām*. If he was not careful then he must stay a full three days at Mina and remember God in those counted days. This meaning has been given in some of the traditions of the imams of Ahl al-Bayt.

… and fear Allah, and know that you [all] shall be gathered together unto Him: The topic ends on the order to fear God and on the reminder that all shall be resurrected and gathered unto Him. Piety and fear of God cannot be complete, and sins not avoided, unless one remembers the Day of Recompense. God says: *Those who go astray from the path of Allah, for them shall surely be a severe punishment, because they forgot the Day of Reckoning* (38:26).

The choice of the word *tuḥsharūn* (you shall be gathered together, at the end of the topic of hajj (where people assemble and gather together from all parts of the world) is highly suitable. Also, it gives a hint that when the pilgrim, at the time of his hajj, sees the gathering and marching together, he should remember the Day when God will gather them together and will not leave any one of them behind.

Examining Narrations

(1) There is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the words of God, *And complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah for Allah*. He said: "They are obligatory." (*al-Tahdhīb* and al-ʿAyyāshī)

(2) There is a tradition narrated by Zurārah, Ḥimrān and Muḥammad b. Muslim from Abū Jaʿfar and Abū ʿAbdillāh (peace be on them). They said: "We asked both imams about the words of God, *And complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah for Allah*. Both replied: 'Verily, it is the completion of hajj that one should not indulge in sexual intercourse, nor in bad language nor in quarrelling.' " (al-ʿAyyāshī)

(3) Imam al-Ṣādiq said in a tradition, among other things: "(God) means by their (*ḥajj* and *ʿumrah*) completion, performing them and guarding oneself from the things which a pilgrim in the condition of *iḥrām* should guard against." (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: There is no conflict in these traditions and the meaning of completion (*itmām*) explained by us in the beginning, because their being obligatory and their performance is the same as completing them.

(4) al-Ḥalabī narrates from Imam al-Ṣādiq that he said: "Verily, when the Messenger of God performed the last pilgrimage (*ḥajj*), he proceeded (from Medina) on the 26th of Dhu al-qaʿdah, until he reached (the Mosque of) Shajarah (which is the *mīqāt* that is, appointed place of *iḥrām* for pilgrims from Medina) and prayed there. Then he led his camel till he reached the desert (that is, open space) and he reaffirmed the intention (*niyyah*) of the *iḥrām* there and said *labbayk Allāhumma labbayk* …(*talbiyah*) of hajj, and drove a hundred camels (of sacrifice); and (likewise) all the people put on the *iḥrām* of hajj; they did not have the intention of *ʿumrah*, and knew nothing about *mutʿah* (enjoyment of *ʿumrah*). When the Messenger of God reached Mecca, he circumambulated the House and the people circumambulated with him; then he prayed two *rakʿah* near the Stand of Abraham and kissed the (Black) Stone. Then he said: 'I begin with what God has begun with.' So, he came to (the hill of) Ṣafā and began from there and went between Ṣafā and Marwah seven times. When he finished his perambulation at Marwah, he stood up before them to give a lecture. (In that lecture he ordered them to end their *iḥrām*, and treat it (the rites performed so far) as *ʿumrah*; and that it was a system ordained by God. So the people ended their *iḥrām*. The Messenger of God told them that had he advanced from his affairs what he had delayed (that is, had he known this system before)

he also would have done as they were doing but he could not do so because he had led his sacrificial animals with him and God had said: and do not shave your heads till the offering reaches its destination. Surāqah b. Jaʿtham al-Kinānī said: 'We have learned our religion as though we were born today. Do you think that this system which you have taught us is only for this year? Or for every year?' The Messenger of God said: 'No. It is for eternity.' And another man stood up and said: 'O Messenger of God! Shall we go out for hajj (on 8th of Dhu al-ḥijjah) and our heads shall be wet (by obligatory bath) because of going unto our women?' The Messenger of God said: 'Verily, you shall never believe in it.'"

The Imam said: "Then ʿAlī proceeded from Yemen till he reached (Mecca near the time of) hajj; and found that Fāṭimah had ended her *iḥrām*, and felt the smell of perfume. So, he went to the Messenger of God, to enquire about it. The Messenger of God asked him: 'O ʿAlī! On what did you raise your voice in *talbiyah* (that is, what was the intention of your hajj)?' He said: '(My intention was) according to the intention of the Prophet.' So, the Messenger of God told him: 'Then you do not end your *iḥrām*.' Then the Prophet gave him a share in his sacrificial animals, he gave him thirty seven and sacrificed himself sixty-three, slaughtering them by his own hand. He took a portion from each sacrifice, put all portions in one pot, and ordered it to be cooked. He ate from it and sipped a little of its soup and said: 'Now we have eaten from all of them. And *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ* (*mutʿah*) is better than *ḥajj al-qirān* in which the pilgrim leads his sacrificial animal, and better than *ḥajj al-ifrād*.' " The narrator says: "I asked the Imam whether the Messenger of God began his *iḥrām* at night in the day-time. The Imam said: 'At day-time.' Then I asked, at what time. The Imam said 'At the prayer of noon (*ẓuhr*)!' (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: This matter has been reported in *Majmaʿ al-bayān* and other books also.

(5) There is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq that he said: "The *ʿumrah* has entered into hajj up to the Day of Resurrection. Then whoever enjoys by *ʿumrah* for the hajj (he should offer) whatever offering (sacrificial animal) is easy to obtain. Now, no one has any option but to perform *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ*, because God sent it down in his book and it was started by the traditions of the Messenger of God."(*al-Tahdhīb*)

(6) There is from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the word of God, whatever offering is easy to obtain, that it is "a goat." (*al-Kāfī*)

(7) There is from the same Imam that he was asked what was the one doing *ḥajj al-tamattuᶜ* to do if he did not get a goat. He said: "He will fast before the day of *tarwiyah* (8th of Dhu al-ḥijjah) and on the day of the *tarwiyah* and the day of *ᶜarafah* (9th of Dhu al-ḥijjah)." He was told: "(Suppose) he reached there on the very day of *tarwiyah*." He replied: "He shall fast three days after *tashrīq* (that is, after 13th)." He was asked: "What if his camel-driver did not stay there?" The Imam said: "He shall fast on the day of *ḥalabah* and the following two days." It was asked: "And what is ḥalabah?" He said: "The day of his (return) journey." It was said: "Will he fast when he is on a journey?" He said: "Yes. Is he not on journey on the day of *ᶜarafah*? Verily, we the Ahl al-Bayt say so. God says, should fast for three days during the hajj. God means in Dhu al-ḥijjah." (*ibid.*)

(8) ash-Shaykh has narrated from Imam al-Ṣādiq that he said: "Whatever is after the *mīqāt* up to Mecca, (its inhabitants) is the dweller of the Sacred Mosque and for him there is no *ḥajj al-tamattuᶜ* (*mutᶜah*)."

Author's comment: It means that the residence of the area from the appointed place of *iḥrām* up to Mecca come under the term "dwellers of the Sacred Mosque" and they cannot do *ḥajj al-tamattuᶜ*. And there are numerous traditions of the same meaning from the imams of Ahl al-Bayt.

(9) There is a tradition from Imam al-Bāqir about the word of God: hajj is the months well-known, that he said: "Hajj is in the months well-known, Shawwāl and Dhu al-qaᶜdah and Dhu al-ḥijjah. Nobody can perform hajj in other months." (*al-Kāfī*)

(10) And there is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the words of God: so whoever determines (to perform) hajj therein, that farḍ (obligation, determination) is (by) *talbiyah* (*labbayk Allāhumma labbayk*) and *ishᶜār* (putting some recognized signs on the sacrificial animals) and *taqlid* (putting a string on its neck). Whichever of these the pilgrim does, he determines to perform the hajj." (*ibid.*)

(11) And there is in the same book from the same Imam under the word of God, *There shall be no uttering unmentionable words…*

that *rafath* means sexual intercourse, *fusūq* means a lie or abuse and *jidāl* is saying, 'No, by God'; 'Yes, by God.'

(12) It is narrated from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the words of God, *There is no blame on you if you seek bounty from your Lord*, that the bounty (*faḍl*) here means sustenance. When the pilgrim has ended his *iḥrām* and performed his rites then he may purchase and sell in that season. (al-ʿAyyāshī)

Author's comment: It is said that according to their belief, trading during the season of hajj was a sin; so God removed this misunderstanding with this verse.

(13) "And it is said that it means that there is no blame on you if you seek forgiveness from your Lord." This meaning has been narrated by Jābir from Abū Jaʿfar. (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: This tradition looks at "bounty" in its generality and interprets it with its best example.

(14) There is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the word of God, Then march on from whence the people march on. He said: "Verily, the people of the *ḥaram* (the Quraysh) used to stay at the Sacred Mosque and other people used to stay at ʿArafāt, and (the Quraysh) did not march on from there until the people of ʿArafāt came in sight (coming from ʿArafāt). There was a man, with the patronymic, Abū Sayyār; he had a fast donkey and always went ahead of the people of ʿArafāt. When he came into sight they said, 'Here is Abū Sayyār' and then started marching on. So, God ordered them (that is, the people of *ḥaram*) that they must stay at ʿArafāt and march on from there." (al-ʿĀyyāshī)

Author's comment: There are other traditions with this meaning.

(15) There is a tradition from the same Imam about the verse: *Our Lord! give us good in this world and good in the Hereafter.* He said: "The pleasure of God and the Garden in the Hereafter, and increase in sustenance and good disposition in this world."
And also he said: "The pleasure of God, and increase in sustenance and good company; and in the Hereafter, the Garden."

(16) And ʿAlī said: "Good in this world is a virtuous wife and good in the Hereafter is the hour; and the chastisement of the Fire is a bad (ill-tempered) wife." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: These traditions give some examples; otherwise

the verse is general. The pleasure of God can be got even in this world, although its complete manifestation will be in the Hereafter. That is why it may be counted as a good in this world (1st tradition) as well as in the Hereafter (2nd tradition).

(17) There is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the word of God, *and remember Allah during the counted number of days*. He said: "and they are the days of brightness (*tashrīq*) (the 11th, 12th and 13th of Lunar month). When the Arabs stayed at Mina after sacrificing the animals, they used to boast against one another. One would say: 'My father used to do this and that.' So God said: *when you have performed your rites, then remember Allah as you remember your fathers, rather a more intense remembrance*." He further said: "And the *takbīr* is *Allahu akbar, Allahu akbar, la ilāha illAllahu waʾllāhu akbar, wa lillahi ʾl-ḥamd, Allahu akbar ᶜalā mā hadānā, Allahu akbar ᶜalā mā razaqanā min bahīmati al-anᶜām*." (*al-Kāfī*)

(18) The same Imam said: "And the *takbīr* is in the days of brightness from the prayer of noon on the day of sacrifice till the prayer of dawn on the third day. And in (other) towns *takbīr* would be (recited) after ten prayers." (*ibid.*)

(19) About the word of God, then whoever hastens off in two days, there is no sin on him, and whoever tarries (there) there is no sin on him, that Imam al-Ṣādiq was asked about it, and he said: "It does not mean that he has the option to do like this if he wishes. But it means that he returns (from hajj) and his sins are forgiven, there is no sin on him." (*Man lā yahḍuruh al faqīh*)

(20) And there is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq that he said: "He returns and his sins are forgiven, there is no sin on him, (this is) for him who guards (himself)." (al-ᶜAyyāshī)

(21) And there is in *al-Faqīh* from the same Imam about the words of God, *[this is] for him who guards [himself]*. He said: "He shall guard himself against hunting till the people of Mina return (from it)."

And Imam al-Bāqir said: "*[This is] for him who guards himself* against sexual intercourse and bad language and quarrelling and those things which God has forbidden in *iḥrām*."

Also he said: "for him who fears God."

And Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "for him who guards himself against big sins."

Author's comment: The meaning of the sentence has already been explained. But it is possible to interpret *taqwā* (piety, fear of God) in its general meaning, as has been done in the last two traditions.

almizan.org

Narrations on *Mutʿatu al-Ḥajj*

(1) al-Bukhārī and al-Bayhaqī have narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās that he was asked about *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ* (*mutʿatu al-ḥajj*). He said: "The Emigrants (*muḥājirīn*) and the Helpers (*anṣār*) and the wives of the Prophet raised their voices in *talbiyah* (that is, put on *iḥrām*) in the last pilgrimage, and we did likewise. When we reached Mecca, the Messenger of God said: 'Make (that is, change) your intention of hajj into that of *ʿumrah*, except the one who has put string on his sacrificial animal.' So we circumambulated the House and (arched) between Ṣafā and Marwah; (then we ended our *iḥrām*) and went to the women and put on (sewn) clothes. And the Prophet said: 'He who puts string on the sacrificial animal shall not end his *iḥrām* until the sacrifice reaches (its destination).' Then he ordered us on the eve of *tarwiyah* (8th of Dhu al-ḥijjah) to raise our voice in *talbiyah* to wear the *iḥrām* of hajj. When we finished the rites (up to Mina), we came and circumambulated the House and (marched) between Ṣafā. and Marwah and our hajj was completed. And on us was a sacrifice, as God said: Whatever offering is easy to obtain, but he who cannot find should fast for three days during the hajj and for seven days when you return to your towns; and a goat is enough. Thus the pilgrims combined the two rites, hajj and *ʿumrah*, in one year. For, verily God sent it down in His Book, and His Prophet promulgated it and made it lawful for all people except the people of Mecca. God has said: this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque. And the months of hajj, which God has mentioned, are Shawwāl, Dhu al-qaʿdah and Dhu al-ḥijjah. Therefore, he who performs *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* in these months, on him is a sacrifice or the (10 days) fast. And *rafath* is sexual intercourse, and *fusūq* is sins and *jidāl* is quarrelling." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(2) al-Bukhārī and Muslim have narrated from Ibn ʿUmar that he

said: "The Messenger of God, in the last pilgrimage, enjoyed (by the ʿ*umrah* for the hajj, and offered the sacrifice. He led the sacrificial animals with him from Dhu al-ḥalīfah. And the Messenger of God began and raised his voice in *talbiyah* (that is, put on *iḥrām*) of ʿ*umrah*. Later on, he raised his voice in *talbiyah* (that is, put on *iḥrām*) of hajj. And the people enjoyed with the Prophet by the ʿ*umrah* for the hajj. Some people had taken their sacrificial animals with them, others had not done so. When the Prophet reached Mecca he told the people: 'Anyone of you who has led his sacrificial animal with him, (shall not end his *iḥrām* and) no such thing, which was forbidden for him, shall be allowed to him until he performs his hajj. And he who has not taken his sacrifice with him, he will go around the House, and (march) between Ṣafā and Marwah, and cut some hair or nails, and his *iḥrām* will come to end; then later he will raise his voice in *talbiyah* (that is, will put on *iḥrām*) of hajj; and if he cannot find an offering, he will fast for three days during the hajj and for seven (days) when he returns to his family.' " (*ibid.*)

(3) al-Hākim has narrated (and said that it is "correct") through Mujāhid and ʿAṭāʾ, from Jābir that he said: "There are many people talking (without knowing the facts). We came out (from Medina) for hajj. When only a few days remained for our *iḥrām* to come to an end, we were ordered to (then and there) finish our *iḥrām*. We said, 'Well, shall one go to ʿArafāt (at the beginning of hajj) with one dripping semen?' This talk reached the Messenger of God, so he stood up to deliver a lecture, and said: 'O people! Do you (want to) teach me about God? For, by God, I am the most knowledgeable of you about God, and the most God-fearing of you. And had I advanced my affair which I kept behind, I would not have taken any sacrifice with me and would have ended my *ihrām* as they had done. Then (at the time of hajj) he who did not have any sacrificial animal would fast for three days in the hajj and for seven (days) when he returns to his family; and he who had found animal would slaughter it. Thus, we slaughtered animals for seven days.' " ʿAṭāʾ said that Ibn ʿAbbās said: "Surely, the Messenger of God distributed sheep and goats among his companions that day; and Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ received a he-goat

and slaughtered it on his own behalf." (*ibid.*)

(4) Ibn Abī Shaybah, al-Bukhārī and Muslim have narrated from ʿImrān b. Ḥalīn that he said: "The verse of *mutʿah* came down in the Book of God and we did it in the company of the Messenger of God, then there did not come down any verse to abrogate the verse of the *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*, nor did (the Messenger of God) forbid it till he died. (And then) one man said by his own opinion what he wished." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: This tradition has been narrated (in another place) with different words but the same meaning.

(5) There is a tradition from Muṭrif that he said: "ʿImrān b. Ḥalīn sent for me in his illness in which he died, and said: 'I was narrating to you some traditions so that God may benefit you by them. Now, if I remain alive, keep them as my secret, and if I die, then narrate them on my authority, because then I will be safe. And know that the Prophet of God combined the hajj and the *ʿumrah*; then nothing was sent down on this subject in the Book of God, nor was it forbidden by the Prophet of God. (But) one man said about it by his own opinion what he wished.' " (Muslim; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *al-Sunan*, *al-Nasāʾī*)

(6) It is reported that ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar was asked about *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*. He said: "It is *ḥalāl* (lawful)." The questioner told him: "Surely, your father forbade it!" He said: "If my father forbade it and the Messenger of God performed it then what do you think I should do? Should I follow the order of my father or the order of the Messenger of God?" The man said: "Rather, the order of the Messenger of God." He said: "Surely the Messenger of God performed it." (at-Tirmidhī, *Zād al-maʿād*)

(7) And there is from Muḥammad b. ʿAbdullāh that he heard Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and Ḍaḥḥāk b. Qays, (in the year when Muʿāwiyah b. Abī Sufyān performed his hajj) talking about enjoyment by *ʿumrah* for hajj. Ḍaḥḥāk said: "Nobody shall do it except he who is ignorant of the command of God." Saʿd replied: "What evil did you utter, O my nephew!" Ḍaḥḥāk said: "But surely ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb forbade it." Saʿd said: "Surely, the Messenger of God did it and we did it in his company." (al-Tirmidhī, *al-Sunan,* al-Nasāʾī*; al-Sunan al-kubrā; al-Muwaṭṭaʾ and al-Umm*)

(8) al-Bukhārī, Muslim and al-Nasāʾī have narrated from Abū Mūsā that he said: "I came to the Messenger of God while he was in al-Baṭḥāʾ. He said: 'Did you raise your voice in *talbiyah* (Did you put on *iḥrām*)?' I said: 'I raised my voice as the Prophet did.' He asked me: 'Have you brought any sacrificial animal?' I said: 'No,' The Prophet said: 'Go around the House and (march) between Ṣafā and Marwah, then end your *iḥrām*.' So I went around the House and (marched) between Ṣafā and Marwah. Then (after ending the *iḥrām*) I went to a woman from my people, she combed my head and I washed my head. Thereafter, I used to give religious decisions during the rule of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Once I was standing in the season (of hajj) when a man came to me and said: 'You do not know what the leader of the faithful (ʿUmar) has invented concerning the rites (of hajj).' So I said: 'O people! Whoever we might have given him our decision, let him wait, because this leader of the faithful is coming to you concerning it.' When he (ʿUmar) arrived, I asked him: 'What have you invented concerning the rites?' He said: 'If we take the Book of God, then God says: And complete the hajj and *ʿumrah* for God, and if we take the tradition of our Prophet, then he did not end his *iḥrām* until he slaughtered the offering.' " (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(9) Muslim has narrated from Abū Naḍrah that he said: "Ibn ʿAbbās used to order *mutʿah* and Ibn al-Zubayr used to forbid it. This was reported to Jābir b. ʿAbdullāh; so he said: 'On my hand the talk progressed. We did *mutʿah* in the company of the Messenger of God; then when ʿUmar stood up (became caliph) he said: "Surely, God used to make lawful for the Messenger of God whatever He wished from whatever He wished. And surely the Qur'an came down gradually. Therefore, complete the hajj and *ʿumrah* as God has ordered you, and separate your hajj from your *ʿumrah*, as it is more complete for your hajj and more complete for your *ʿumrah*.' " " (*ibid.*)

(10) And there is from Abū Mūsā that ʿUmar said: "It (that is, *mutʿah*) is the *sunnah* (custom) of the Messenger of God. But I am afraid that they will sleep with them (that is, the women) under the trees and then proceed with them as pilgrims." (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal)

(11) There is a tradition from Saʿīd b. Musayyab (that he said)that

ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb forbade *mutʿah* in the months of hajj and said: "I performed it in the company of the Messenger of God and I forbid it. And it is because one of you comes from a far away place dishevelled, worn out, having the intention of ʿ*umrah* in the months of hajj. And his dishevelment, and tiredness and *talbiyah* are only for his ʿ*umrah*. Then he arrives and goes around the House, and ends his *iḥrām* and wears (sewn clothes) and uses perfume and sleeps with his wife if she is with him. Thereafter, when the day of *tarwiyah* comes he raises his voice in *talbiyah* of hajj and proceeds to Minā, saying *talbiyah* of hajj in which there is neither dishevelment, nor tiredness nor *talbiyah* except for one day only. And the hajj is better than ʿ*umrah*. If we leave them on this system, they shall embrace them (that is, the women) under the trees. Moreover, the people of the House (that is, Meccans) have neither any cattle nor any crop, and their spring is only those who stay with them." (*Jamʿu al jawāmiʿ*)

(12) There is from Muslim from Abū Naḍrah from Jābir. (Abū Naḍrah) said: "I said: 'Verily, Ibn al-Zubayr forbids *mutʿah* and Ibn ʿAbbās orders it.' He (Jābir) said: 'On my hand the talk progressed. We did *mutʿah* in the company of the Messenger of God and in the company of Abū Bakr. When ʿUmar became ruler, he delivered a lecture before the people and said: "Verily, the Messenger of God is this Messenger, and the Qur'an is this Qur'an. And, surely, there were two *mutʿah's* in the days of the Messenger of God, and I forbid them and shall inflict punishment for them; one of them is the *mutʿah* of women; and I will not get hold of a man who marries a woman for a period, but that I shall eliminate him with stones; and the second is the *mutʿah* of hajj." ' " (*al-Sunan al-kubrā*)

(13) There is a tradition from Ibn ʿAbbās that he said that he heard ʿUmar saying: "By God, verily I forbid you the *mutʿah*, and surely it is in the Book of God and surely the Messenger of God performed it." He meant ʿ*umrah* in the hajj. (*al-Sunan*, al-Nasāʾī)

(14) Muslim has narrated from ʿAbdullāh b. Shaqīq that he said: " ʿUthmān used to forbid the *mutʿah* and ʿAlī used to order it. So, ʿUthmān said something to ʿAlī and ʿAlī said: 'Surely, you know that we performed *mutʿah* in the company of the Messenger of God.' ʿUthmān said: 'But we were afraid.' " (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(15) Ibn Abī Shaybah and Muslim have narrated from Abū Dharr: "*Mutʿah* in the hajj was (prescribed) especially for the companions of Muḥammad." (*ibid*)

(16) Muslim has narrated from Abū Dharr that: "The two *mutʿah's* are not suitable but for us especially." He meant the *mutʿah* of women and *mutʿah* of hajj. (*ibid*.)

Author's comment: The traditions of this meaning are very numerous, but we have quoted only what was relevant to the scope of our discussion, and that is to discuss the prohibition of *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* from the point of view of the *Tafsīr.* Sometimes, the argument about it is to see whether the person who prohibited it was right or not, or whether he had any excuse for it or not. But such a discussion comes under *ʿilm al-kalām* (Theology); it is outside the limits of our book. And sometimes, the arguments are to see what reasoning has been advanced in the traditions concerning this subject, with special reference to the Qur'an and the *sunnah*. Such a discussion is based on the meaning of the Qur'an and the traditions. And it is relevant to the subject of this book of ours.

Therefore, we shall look, one by one, into the arguments put in these traditions:

First Argument: It is claimed that the words of God, *And complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah for Allah* show that *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ* is not lawful, and that *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ* was especially allowed for the Messenger of God. This argument has been put in the tradition of Abū Naḍrah from Jābir that ʿUmar said: "Surely, God used to make lawful for the Messenger of God whatever He wished from whatever He wished. And surely the Qur'an came down gradually. Therefore, complete the hajj and *ʿumrah* as God has ordered you."

Reply: You very well know that the words of God, *And complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah for Allah …* do not say anything except that it is obligatory to complete the hajj and *ʿumrah* after one determines to perform them. For a further proof, see the next sentence, *but if you are prevented*, that is, from completing them.

Complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah cannot, by any stretch of imagination, mean that *ʿumrah* and hajj should not be combined. Likewise, there is not even an iota of proof that combining the *ʿumrah* and the hajj was an order given specially to the Prophet only, or to him and his companions on the last pilgrimage only.

By saying that it was an order especially for the Prophet and/or his companions, one has to accept that it was a system established by the Messenger of God. See the tradition of al-Nasā'ī from Ibn ʿAbbās that he heard ʿUmar saying: "By God, verily I forbid you the *mutʿah*, and surely it is in the Book of God and surely the Messenger of God performed it."

Second Argument: *Mutʿatu al-ḥajj* was forbidden on the basis of the Book of God and the tradition of the Prophet. This argument is seen in the tradition of Abū Mūsā, where ʿUmar told him: "If we take the Book of God, then God says, *And complete the ḥajj and ʿumrah for Allah*, and if we take the tradition of our Prophet then (we find that) he did not end the *ihrām* until he slaughtered the offering."

Replies: So far as the Book of God is concerned, it has just been shown that it goes against his claim.

His reference to the tradition of the Prophet is equally weak:

First, he contradicts himself in this claim. He has already said in other traditions (some of which have been quoted earlier) that "surely the Messenger of God performed it."

Second: The traditions loudly say that the Messenger of God performed it; and that once he raised his voice in *talbiyah* of *ʿumrah* and later on raised his voice in *talbiyah* of hajj; and that he admonished the people, saying, "Do you (want to) teach me about God?"

The claim of Ibn Taymiyyah at this juncture that the Messenger of God had performed *ḥajj al-qirān* that year is a very astonishing thing. Even more amusing is his claim that *ḥajj al-qirān* was called *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*!!

Third: What the traditions say is that the Prophet did not shave his head after performing the *ʿumrah*, because his sacrificial animals had not yet reached their destination. But it does not mean that he had not ended his *iḥrām* of *ʿumrah* or that he went to hajj with the same *iḥrām*. The verse clearly says that the pilgrim who leads his offerings with him, is not to shave his head until the offering reaches its destination. Also, it clearly says that the one whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque shall do *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*. If a non-resident pilgrim brings his offering with him, he is obliged to perform *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* (because he is non-resident) and at the same time, not to shave his head (because the offering is yet to reach its destination.) Merely not shaving the head does not mean that one has not ended one's *iḥrām* of *ʿumrah*.

Fourth: Let us accept, for the sake of argument, that the Messenger of

God himself did not perform *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*. But it is universally accepted that he ordered all his companions and family members to perform their hajj according to the newly established system of *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*. Now which of the two could be called the system promulgated by the Prophet for his *ummah*? The one which was especially meant for his own self'? Or the other which he ordered his *ummah* to follow and which was also supported by the Qur'an?

Third Argument: It was claimed, that *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* creates a situation which is not suitable for the pilgrims. After *ʿumrah* and before hajj, he is allowed to wear beautiful clothes, use perfume and sleep with the women. And it is against the dignity of hajj. This claim is found in the traditions of Abū Mūsā in which ʿUmar is reported as saying: "But I am afraid that they will sleep with them (women) under the trees and then proceed with them as pilgrims." And as he said, according to another tradition: "Surely I know that the Prophet and his companions did it. But I did not like them sleeping with them (that is, with their women) under the trees and then proceeding to hajj with the water dropping from their heads" (because of the obligatory bath).

Replies: It is preferring one's own opinion against a clear order of God. God and His Messenger had clearly promulgated the system of *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*; and God and His Messenger knew very well that this system would lead to this supposedly undesirable effect. Still they thought it good for the Muslims. Then why should ʿUmar be afraid of this effect?

It is interesting to note that the relevant verse of the Qur'an gives the same reason for the promulgation of this system which he is using to show his displeasure and dislike. God says: *then whoever enjoys by the ʿumrah for ḥajj*. What is the meaning of enjoyment if not 'taking one's fill of the pleasure,' 'sleeping one self with sexual activities, fine clothes, and so on.' So, God mentions it approvingly and ʿUmar disliked it and was displeased with it!!

We are even more astonished when we see that the companions had offered the same criticism against God and His Prophet (when the verse was revealed and the Prophet ordered them to adopt the system of *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*) which ʿUmar used as the basis of his prohibition. See the tradition reported in *al-Durr al-manthūr* through al-Hākim from Jābir in which he says: "We said: 'Well, shall one go to ʿArafāt with one's organ dripping semen?' This talk reached the Messenger of God, so he stood up to deliver

a lecture" and replied to their objection and again ordered to perform *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* as he had ordered them the first time. Was that reply not enough to bury such displeasure for ever?

Fourth Argument: It is said that this system badly affects the market of Mecca. We see this argument in the tradition of al-Suyūtī from Saʿīd b. Musayyab, in which ʿUmar says: "The people of the House have neither any cattle nor any crop, and their spring is only those who stay with them."

Replies: This also is preferring one's own opinion against a clear order of God.

Moreover, God has refuted such claims in a similar situation where He says: *O you who believe! Verily, the idolators are unclean, so they shall not approach the Sacred Mosque after this very year; and if you fear poverty, then soon Allah will enrich you through His grace, if He please; Surely Allah is All-knowing, All-wise* (9:28).

Fifth Argument: It is claimed that *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* is allowed when one is afraid, and when there is no fear there should be no *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* . It is seen in the tradition of Muslim from ʿAbdullāh b. Shaqīq that ʿUthmān said to ʿAlī: "But we were afraid." Also it is written in *al-Durr al-manthūr* that Ibn Abī Shaybah, Ibn Jarīr and Ibn al-Mundhir have reported from Ibn al-Zubayr that he said in a lecture: "O people! By God, enjoying by ʿ*umrah* for hajj is not as you do. It is for the men who raises his voice in *talbiyah* of hajj, then he is prevented by an enemy or illness or fracture or any other reasons till the days of hajj are gone, then he reaches (Mecca); so he shall change it to ʿ*umrah*, and go on enjoying until the next year; then he shall perform hajj and offer sacrifice. This is the meaning of enjoyment by ʿ*umrah* to hajj."

Replies: The verse is general and unconditional; it covers those who are afraid as well as those who are not afraid. It has been explained earlier that the sentence which promulgates *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* is the verse: *this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque*. And it is without any condition.

Moreover, the traditions clearly say that the Prophet performed his last pilgrimage as *ḥajj al-tamattuʿ* and he did the intention (*niyyah*) of *iḥrām* twice—first for ʿ*umrah* and later for hajj. And nobody can say that at that time there was any risk or danger for the Muslims.

Sixth Argument: It is claimed in the two traditions of Abū Dharr, reported in *al-Durr al-manthūr*, that *mutʿatu al-ḥajj* was a system meant

especially for the companions of the Prophet.

Replies: If it means what ʿUthmān and Ibn al-Zubayr claimed that they were at that time in danger and, therefore, it was allowed to them, then the reply given to the fifth argument applies here also.

But if it means that it was a special rule made for them only, then it is refuted by the words of God: *this is for him whose family dwells not near the Sacred Mosque*. It does not say, "this is for the companions of Muḥammad only."

Moreover, if it was meant especially for the companions of the Prophet, then why did some of the companions, like ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, Ibn al-Zubayr, Abū Mūsā, Muʿāwiyah, and, according to a report, Abū Bakr reject it?

Seventh Argument: Some people say that ʿUmar prohibited it by his own authority as he was Master of the Affairs (*khalīfah*) (*waliy al-amr*) and God has made it obligatory on the Muslims to obey the Masters of the Affairs, as He says: *Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger and the Masters of the affair from among you* (4:59).

Replies: The authority vested in the Masters of the Affairs does not cover this case. There are very many verses in the Qur'an which show that.

It is compulsory to obey and follow what God has revealed to His Prophet: *Follow what has been sent down to you from your Lord …* (7:3)

Whatever was ordained and promulgated by the Prophet was according to the command of God, as may be understood from the verses: *… nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited …*(9:29), *… and whatever the Messenger gives you, accept it, and from whatever he forbids you keep back …* (59:7). The meaning of *gives you* is 'orders you,' because it is used here as the opposite of "forbids you." It is obligatory to obey God and His Messenger by doing what he orders and keeping back from what he forbids.

Likewise, the judgement and decision must be according to the revelation sent down by God: *and whoso judges not by what Allah has sent down, these then are the unjust* (5:45); *and whoso judges not by what Allah has sent down, these then are the transgressors* (5:47); *and whoso judges not by what Allah has sent down these then are infidels* (5:44). Again God says: *And it is not for a believer man or woman to have any choice in their affair when Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter; and whoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, indeed he has strayed off a manifest straying* (33:36);

And thy Lord creates whatever He pleases, and chooses too; it is not theirs to choose … (28:68). Choosing means judging and legislating, or else it is general in meaning which includes judging and legislating too.

The Qur'an has openly declared that it is a Book not to be abrogated and that its laws will remain as they are up to the Day of Resurrection. *And surely it is Mighty Book. Falsehood shall not come to it from before it nor from behind it; a revelation from the All-wise, the Most Praised One* (41:41-42). The verse is general and the "falsehood" includes abrogation also, which is rejected by this verse.

In short, whatever has been ordained by God and His Prophet, or whatever has been decided by God and His Prophet must be obeyed and followed by the whole *ummah*, the rulers as well as the ruled.

It is obvious from above that the words of God, *Obey Allah and obey the Messenger and the Masters of the Affair from among you*, gives "the Master of Affairs" authority in other than the shariah. Because protecting and following the shariah is obligatory on the rulers as well as the others; nay! it is more binding on the rulers. The authority of the Masters of Affair (*ʿulu al-amr*) is confined to giving orders which they think to be in the interest of the *ummah* provided that the command of God concerning that matter is protected and followed. It is only then that the *ummah* is expected to obey them.

A man has an option to eat on a certain day and abstain from food next day, while he accepts that it is lawful to him to eat from his own money. He is free to sell or buy at any time, or not to do so, if he so wishes, while the basic matter—trade—is lawful. If someone quarrels with him about his property, he may appeal to the judge to protect his right; on the other hand, he may refrain from doing so; but the basic shariah will remain in force that it is his right to bring the matter before the judge. It all depends on his own choice on what he thinks to be in his best interest. But the basic rules remain intact, that it is lawful for him to eat, sell and buy, or to put his case before the judge.

But he has no right to drink liquor, or take interest or usurp other's property, even if he thought that it was in his best interest. Why? Because it directly conflicts with the laws ordained by God.

The above were the examples of personal affairs. In the same way the ruler has the authority to manage the affairs of the state according to the best interest of the *ummah*, but always protecting and preserving the

laws of God as He has ordained. For example, he may decide to defend a frontier of the Islamic state at a certain time, or to retreat from it if it is more advantageous. He may announce a public holiday on a certain day and things like that, as he, in his best judgement, thinks beneficial for the *ummah*. But he cannot change the shariah.

In short, as an individual has a right to take a decision in his personal or family affairs, keeping within the limits imposed by the relevant laws, so also, a ruler appointed by the authority of the Messenger of God has the authority to take a decision in the affairs of the state and the *ummah*, keeping within the relevant laws ordained by God.

Had a ruler been given authority to manipulate the laws of the divine shariah, if he thought that the manipulation was in the interest of *ummah*, no rule and no law could remain intact; the talk that the shariah of Islam was to continue up to the Day of Resurrection would become meaningless.

What is the difference between the three statements appended below?

"The law of enjoying the good things of life is not suitable for the pilgrim who was expected to spend his time in devotion and worship. Therefore, this law must be abolished."

"The laws legalizing slavery are not suitable for the modern world which stands for general freedom. Therefore, these laws must be abolished."

"The penal code of Islam cannot be tolerated by the advanced human society of modern times, nor is that code in conformity with current codes. Therefore, this code must be abolished."

Why should the first statement be accepted and the others rejected?

Some traditions on this subject show that this basic principle was raised during that controversy. Isḥāq b. Rāʿwiyah (in his *al-Musnad*) and Aḥmad have narrated from Hasan: "Verily, ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb wanted to prohibit *mutʿatu al-ḥajj*. Ubay b. Kaʿb stood up and said: 'You have no right to do so. Surely, the Book of God came with it (that is, it was promulgated by the Qur'an) and we did ʿ*umrah* (of *tamattuʿ*) with the Messenger of God.' There upon, ʿUmar came down." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

almizan.org

Verses 204-207

almizan.org

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يُعْجِبُكَ قَوْلُهُ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَيُشْهِدُ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ مَا فِي قَلْبِهِ وَهُوَ
أَلَدُّ الْخِصَامِ ﴿٢٠٤﴾ وَإِذَا تَوَلَّىٰ سَعَىٰ فِي الْأَرْضِ لِيُفْسِدَ فِيهَا وَيُهْلِكَ الْحَرْثَ وَالنَّسْلَ ۗ
وَاللَّهُ لَا يُحِبُّ الْفَسَادَ ﴿٢٠٥﴾ وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُ اتَّقِ اللَّهَ أَخَذَتْهُ الْعِزَّةُ بِالْإِثْمِ ۚ فَحَسْبُهُ
جَهَنَّمُ ۚ وَلَبِئْسَ الْمِهَادُ ﴿٢٠٦﴾ وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَشْرِي نَفْسَهُ ابْتِغَاءَ مَرْضَاتِ اللَّهِ ۗ
وَاللَّهُ رَءُوفٌ بِالْعِبَادِ ﴿٢٠٧﴾

(2:204) *And among men is he whose talk in the life of this world pleases you, and takes Allah to witness as to what is in his heart, yet he is the most violent of adversaries.*

(2:205) *And when he becomes ruler, he strives on earth that he may cause mischief therein and destroy the crop and the progeny; and Allah does not love mischief.*

(2:206) *And when it is said to him, fear Allah, he is overcome by honor [pride] by sin; so enough for him is Hell; and certainly it is an evil abode.*

(2:207) *And Among men is he who sells his self [soul] to seek the pleasure of Allah; and Allah is Affectionate to the servants.*

Introduction

This is another classification of men according to their character. As the preceding verses (200-202) classified them according to their want of this world or the Hereafter, these verses do so from the point of view of their hypocrisy or the sincerity of their faith. And this is the link between these and the preceding verses.

Commentary

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يُعْجِبُكَ قَوْلُهُ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَيُشْهِدُ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ مَا فِي قَلْبِهِ وَهُوَ

أَلَدُّ الْخِصَامِ ﴿٢٠٤﴾

(2:204) ***And among men is he whose talk in the life of this world pleases you, and takes Allah to witness as to what is in his heart, yet he is the most violent of adversaries:***

Aʿjabahu means gave him pleasure, delighted him. The words, *in the life of this world* are connected with, *pleases you*. The meaning is: his talk pleases you in this life, because in this life one has to rely on appearances. The deeper traits and inner feelings are hidden behind a curtain which cannot be lifted at all, although sometimes some clues are found which help one to surmise what lies behind the curtain.

Then come the words: *and takes Allah to witness as to what is in his heart.* He talks in a way that pleases you: he seems eager to protect the way of the truth, appears keen to do good for the people, looks enthusiastic for the advancement of the cause of the religion and the *ummah*. And to show that his voice comes from the depth of his heart, he calls on God to be his witness. But, in reality he is the most virulent enemy of the truth.

Aladd is the adjective in superlative degree, derived from *ladda ludūdan* (he became a very violent adversary.) *Khiṣām* is plural of *khalm* by the paradigm of *ṣaʿb:ṣiʿāb* and *kaʿb:kiʿāb*. Also it is said that it is an infinitive verb, and that *aladd al-khiṣām* means "most violent in enmity."

إِذَا تَوَلَّىٰ سَعَىٰ فِي الْأَرْضِ لِيُفْسِدَ فِيهَا وَيُهْلِكَ الْحَرْثَ وَالنَّسْلَ ۗ وَاللَّهُ لَا يُحِبُّ الْفَسَادَ ﴿٢٠٥﴾

(2:205) ***And when he becomes ruler, he strives on earth that he may cause mischief therein and destroy the crop and the progeny; and Allah does not love mischief:***

Tawallī means to get authority and power. Further support of this meaning comes from the next verse: he is overcome by honor (pride) by sin. It shows that he has got an honor (that is, a cause of pride) earned with sin. (The sin is committed by his heart that does not conform with his tongue.)

Saʿy means to strive, to walk hurriedly. Thus the verse means: When this hypocrite, this most violent of adversaries, gets a chance to do something, and is given authority and rules over the people, he hastens hither and thither and strives to create mischief in the land.

Tawallī may also mean to turn back, to be out of sight. In that case the verse would mean: "And when he turns back (from you), his actions in your absence belie his talk in your presence." The enthusiasm for the common welfare and the good of the *ummah* turns into striving in the land to create mischief and evil.

… and destroy the crop and the progeny: Apparently it is a description of the mischief. He creates mischief by destroying the crop and the progeny. The continued existence of the human species depends on food and procreation. These are the two most essential things which the human species cannot do without. Procreation is clear from the word 'progeny.' So far as food is concerned, man acquires it from the animal and the plant; animals again acquire it from plants. Thus, the basis of food is the plant which is obtained from crops. That is why the mischief and destruction has been explained in terms of crops and progeny. The verse means that he creates mischief and destruction in the earth by eliminating through the destruction of crop and progeny.

… and Allah does not love mischief: *Fasād* literally means deterioration, corruption, decay, negation, immorality; here it has been translated as mischief.

Fasād in this sentence does not refer to the physical decay or destruction in this world. This universe is based on such a system that every destruction leads to a subsequent construction. A struggle for survival is continuously going on; every existence is followed by extinction, every life by death. Both are found in this natural cosmos side by side. This is the system created by God; and how can He hate a thing which He Himself has created and decreed?

It follows that the "mischief" here refers to corruption in the shariah and legislation. God ordained the laws of religion for the betterment of the actions of His servants; these laws will improve their character and traits; they will keep human society and human beings on the straight path, on the path of moderation. Thereupon, they will find happiness and prosperity in this life as well as in the life Hereafter. (This will be further explained under the verse 2:213)

Then this man appears on the scene whose words belie his inner feelings; he starts running hither and thither to create immorality and mischief on the earth. He pretends to improve society, but in reality he destroys. He alters the words of God by giving them a wrong meaning;

he changes the laws ordained by God; he manipulates the teachings of the religion. All this leads to depravity of character and perennial controversy in religion and society. And, in this manner, the religion is negated, humanity is eliminated and the whole world is ruined.

To appreciate how true these verses are, look at the history of Islam and see how unauthorized people took the reins of the state in their hands, how they imposed themselves on the Muslim *ummah* and how they corruptly conducted the affairs of religion and state. They did what they did and the losers were the religion (which got nothing but evil results), the Muslims (who are always in decline and decadence) and the *ummah* (which is perennially plagued with internal strife and dispute.) The religion is now a ball in the hands of anyone who wants to play with; and human values a toy to be treasured and then discarded at the whim of the child.

The result of this striving of that hypocrite is decay and deterioration on the earth; first, he corrupted religion and then destroyed humanity. That is why in some traditions, *and destroy the crops and progeny* has been interpreted as the destruction of religion and humanity.

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُ اتَّقِ اللَّهَ أَخَذَتْهُ الْعِزَّةُ بِالْإِثْمِ ۚ فَحَسْبُهُ جَهَنَّمُ ۚ وَلَبِئْسَ الْمِهَادُ ﴿٢٠٦﴾

(2:206) ***And when it is said to him, fear Allah, he is overcome by honor [pride] by sin; so enough for him is Hell; and certainly it is an evil abode:***

ʿIzzah means honor, *mihād* is the paved way, abode. Apparently, the words by sin qualify the word, the honor, and have no connection with he is overcome. The verse says that when he is told to fear God, he is overcome by the apparent honor which he has earned through his sins and hypocrisy.

The real honor comes from God as He says: *and Thou exaltest whom Thou pleasest and abasest whom Thou pleasest* (3:26); *and to Allah belongs the honor and to His Messenger and to the believer* (63:8); *Do they seek honor from them? Then, surely all honor belongs to Allah* (4:139). Honor is a status which God attributes to Himself and declares that it is only He who bestows it on His chosen creatures. Such a thing cannot be a source of sin or evil. It naturally follows that the honor mentioned in this verse is not real honor which is given by God. It is only a masquerade which deceives none except the ignorant people who mistakenly accept it as honor.

The preposition "by" (*b*) in "by sin" (*bi al-ithm*) has no connection with the verb he is overcome; the word "sin" is neither the object of "is overcome," nor its cause. In other words, the verse does not say that his

honor or pride drives him to sin and to rejection of the advice to fear God, or incites him to answer back the said advisor in unbecoming language. Nor does it mean that sin drives him to pride. As mentioned above, the word by sin qualifies the word honor (or pride), and indicates the honor or pride gained by sin. Had the word honor been left unconditional, it would have meant that God recognized it as real honor (which comes from God). And in that case it could not be said to create, or be created by, sin or pride. That is why we say that it is conditional and means an apparent honor which is earned through sin and hypocrisy.

There is another verse where the word honor (*ʿizzah*) has been used for the unbelievers. But there, also, the context shows that it means only an appearance of honor, not real honor. God says: *Nay, those who disbelieve are [steeped] in self-exaltation* (ʿizzatin) *and opposition. How many did We destroy of the generations before them, then they cried but there was no longer any escape* (38:2-3). Here the word *ʿizzatin* (translated above as "self-exaltation") is a common noun, it does not have any definite article before it, and the next verse describes the destruction of people like them. These points clearly show that here also it is only an appearance of honor, a passing shadow which will not last long.

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَشْرِى نَفْسَهُ ابْتِغَاءَ مَرْضَاتِ اللَّهِ ۗ وَاللَّهُ رَءُوفٌ بِالْعِبَادِ ﴿٢٠٧﴾

(2:207) ***And among the man is he who sells his self*** **(nafs)** ***to seek the pleasure of Allah; and Allah is Affectionate to the servants:***

This verse is in contrast to the preceding three ones. On one side there is a man priding himself in his sins, boasting and self-exalting, showing the doing of good to people, hiding his hypocrisy behind a mask of charming words; and religion and humanity cannot expect of him anything except ruin and destruction.

On the other side is a man who has sold his soul to God, he wants nothing except what God wishes; he desires nothing for his self; his honor and strength come only from God, and he seeks nothing but the pleasure of God. By his presence, religious and worldly affairs reacquire their correct shape, the truth is revived, humanity enjoys a happy life and the good effects of Islam reach every one.

This also shows the connection of the end of the verse, *and Allah is Affectionate to the servants*, with its beginning. Surely, the presence of such a man is a great mercy from God to His servants. Had there not been

such virtuous people to counteract the designs of those others (whose stock-in-trade is hypocrisy and mischief), the structure of religion would have fallen into ruins, and the foundation of righteousness and goodness would have been destroyed. But it is the method chosen by God that He removes that wrong by this truth, and repairs the damage inflicted by His enemies with the good spread by His beloved and chosen servants. He has said: *And were it not for Allah's repelling some men with others, the earth certainly would be in a state of disorder* (2:251); *And had there not been Allah's repelling some people by others, certainly would have been pulled down cloisters, and churches, and synagogues, and mosques in which Allah's name is much remembered* (22:40); *therefore if these disbelievers in it, We have already entrusted it with a people who are not disbelievers in it* (6:89). The decadence brought upon the religion and the world by those who love nothing but their own selves cannot be removed except through the good overflowing from those who have sold their souls to God, who love nothing except God and who desire nothing except that the world and the people of the world may become virtuous.

This deal has been praised by God in many verses, one of which is as follows: *Surely Allah has bought from the believers their selves and their properties, for this that their's be the Garden; they fight in Allah's way, so they slay and are slain; [this is] a promise which is binding on Him in the Torah and the Injīl and the Qur'an; and who is more faithful to his covenant than Allah? Therefore, rejoice in the trade that you have transacted; and that is the great achievement* (9:111).

Examining Narrations

(1) It is reported from al-Suddī about the verses, *And among the men is he whose talk … an evil abode*, that they were revealed about Akhnas b. Sharīq al-Thaqafī, an ally of Banū Zuhrah. He came to the Prophet in Medina and said: "I have come seeking Islam, and God knows that surely I am truthful." The Prophet was pleased with that talk. The words of God, and takes God to witness as to what is in his heart refer to this aspect. Then he went out and passed by an agricultural field and some donkeys belonging to some Muslims. He burnt the filth and wounded and killed the donkeys. It was about that the verse was revealed, and when he turns away (from you) he runs hither and thither on earth so

that he may cause mischief therein and destroy the tillage and the stock. (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(2) It is narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās that the three verses were revealed about the hypocrites because he shows what is opposed to what he hides in his heart. The author of *al-Majmaʿ* (said that the same was also narrated from Imam al-Ṣādiq. (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: But this interpretation does not fit the apparent meaning of the verse.

It is written in some traditions narrated from the imams of Ahl al-Bayt that these verses were revealed about their enemies.

(3) It is narrated from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the words of God, and destroy the crop and progeny, that crop means religion, and progeny, humanity. (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: This tradition has already been explained earlier. In another tradition the crop has been interpreted as 'progeny and crop.' It is easy to see how this also may fit the earlier explanation.

(4) al-Shaykh has narrated in his al-Amālī a tradition from ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, about the verse: *And among men is he who sells… Affectionate to the servants*, that he said: "It was revealed about (Imam) ʿAlī when he slept (on the night of *hijrah*) on the bed of the Messenger of God."

Author's comment: There are innumerable traditions from both Shia and Sunni chains that this verse was revealed about (Imam) ʿAlī concerning his sacrifice on the night of *hijrah*. *Tafsīr al-burhān* gives five of those chains from al-Thaʿlabī and others.

(5) Ibn Marduwayh has narrated from Ṣuhayb that he said: "When I intended to emigrate from Mecca to the Prophet in Medina, the Qurayshites told me, 'O Ṣuhayb! You came to us and you had no wealth. Now you want to emigrate with all this wealth of yours. By God, this can't be.' So I said to them, 'What do you think? Would you leave me if I gave you all my wealth?' They said: 'Yes!' Thereupon I gave them my wealth and they left me. I came out till I reached Medina. This incident was reported to the Prophet and he said: 'Ṣuhayb profited twice.' " (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: He has narrated it from some other chains also, some of which add: and then the verse was revealed: *And among men is he who sells his soul …*

Some other traditions say that it was revealed about Ṣuhayb and Abū Dharr because they purchased themselves by giving away their properties. But the verse does not say, "he who purchases …," it says, he who sells. And the interpretation of the verses does not agree with the meaning of "purchase."

(6) There is a tradition from ʿAlī that this verse refers to a man who is killed because of enjoining to do good and forbidding to do bad. (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: It is one example of the general meaning of the verse. There is no difficulty in explaining the meaning of the verse in general terms, though it was sent down on a particular occasion for a particular person.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verses 208-210

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ادْخُلُوا فِي السِّلْمِ كَافَّةً وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا خُطُوَاتِ الشَّيْطَانِ ۚ إِنَّهُ
لَكُمْ عَدُوٌّ مُبِينٌ ﴿٢٠٨﴾ فَإِنْ زَلَلْتُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا جَاءَتْكُمُ الْبَيِّنَاتُ فَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ
عَزِيزٌ حَكِيمٌ ﴿٢٠٩﴾ هَلْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمُ اللَّهُ فِي ظُلَلٍ مِنَ الْغَمَامِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ
وَقُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ ۚ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ تُرْجَعُ الْأُمُورُ ﴿٢١٠﴾

(2:208) *O you who believe! Enter you one and all into submission wholly and do not follow the footsteps of Satan; surely he is to you an open enemy.*

(2:209) *But if you slip after clear signs have come to you, then know that Allah is Mighty, Wise.*

(2:210) *Do they await aught but that Allah should come to them in the canopies of bright cloud and the angels; and the matter is decreed away; and all matters are returned to Allah.*

Introduction

These three verses, together with the four that follow them, guide us as how to preserve religious unity in human society: To enter into total submission, to limit oneself to the word spoken by God and to that deed whose path is shown by God. They declare that religious unity was never disintegrated, nor was the happiness of both worlds turned into misery with disaster visited upon the territory of a people, except when they left submission, manipulated the signs of God by altering them and putting them into the wrong place. This had happened to the children of Israel and other people, and will surely happen to this *ummah* also. But in the end God promises them His help, surely the help of God is near.

Commentary

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ادْخُلُوا فِي السِّلْمِ كَافَّةً وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا خُطُوَاتِ الشَّيْطَانِ ۚ إِنَّهُ

لَكُمْ عَدُوٌّ مُبِينٌ ﴿٢٠٨﴾

(2:208) ***O you who believe! Enter you one and all into submission wholly and do not follow the footsteps of Satan; surely he is to you an open enemy:***

Silm (submission), *islām* and *taslīm* are all the same. *Kāffatan* is for emphasis and means 'all,' 'wholly.' As the verse is addressed to the believers, and they are ordered to enter into submission "wholly" the command covers the whole group as well as every individual. It is obligatory on each and every believer, as it is on the whole of Muslim society not to contravene this command and to submit all matters to God and His Messenger. Hence the phrase, *one and all* in the translation.

Again, as the hearers are already believers the submission called for means total submission to God after believing in Him. Hence the word *wholly* in the translation. It follows that the believers must submit all their affairs to God, they should not decide themselves what was good for them and what was not, they should not prepare or select any path for themselves without the guidance of God and His Messenger. They must remember that no people were destroyed except that they followed their own views and desires, and talked without true knowledge; and no people forfeited the right of life and happiness except that they became disunited.

It is clear from the above that following the footsteps of Satan does not mean following him in all the falsehood which he invites to, because a believer cannot follow Satan in all satanic schemes. Rather, it means to follow him in the matters of religion. Satan furnishes some paths of untruth with the signposts of truth; in this way, he puts into religion what is not from religion. Thus, a believer is deceived into following that path without realizing his error.

One way of becoming aware of such an interpolation is to find out whether God and His Messenger have ever mentioned it in their teachings of the religion.

The context and words of the verses also show what has been explained above. "Footsteps" are found in a trodden path. The believer is proceeding on that path; therefore, it must be the path of true religion. But Satan has put his marks thereon. So, the footsteps of Satan should refer to satanic ways within the highway of true faith. The believer is obliged to enter into submission. Therefore, wherever he proceeds without wholly submitting

himself to God and His Messenger, it must be in the footsteps of Satan. If he goes on to that path, he is following Satan's footsteps.

This verse is similar to some others. For example: *O men! Eat of what is in the earth lawful and good, and do not follow the footsteps of Satan; surely he is to you an open enemy. He only enjoins you evil and indecency, and that you should say against Allah what you do not know* (2:168-169); *O you who believe! Do not follow the footsteps of Satan; and whoever follows the footsteps of Satan, then surely he enjoins indecency and evil* (24:21); *Eat of what Allah has given you and do not follow the footsteps of Satan, then surely he enjoins indecency and evil* (24:21); *Eat of what Allah has given you and do not follow the footsteps of Satan; surely he is your open enemy* (6:142). The difference between the verse under discussion and those quoted above is that this verse addresses the group as a whole, as it contains the word *kāffatan* (all, wholly); but those other verses are general. Accordingly, this verse implies the same meaning as the verses, *And hold fast by the cord of Allah all together and be not divided (*3:103); *And surely this My path is straight one, so follow it; and do not follow the [other] ways, for they will scatter you from His path* (6:153).

The verse implies that Islam guarantees that it contains all kind of laws and knowledge which are needed by the human beings for their welfare and good.

فَإِنْ زَلَلْتُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا جَاءَتْكُمُ الْبَيِّنَاتُ فَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ عَزِيزٌ حَكِيمٌ ﴿٢٠٩﴾

(2:209) ***But if you slip after clear signs have come to you, then know that Allah is Mighty, Wise:***

Zallah means a slip, a falling. The verse says: If you did not enter one and all into submission, wholly and slipped—and the slip refers to following the footsteps of Satan—then know that God is Mighty, Who is not prevailed upon in His orders, and Wise, Who decides in your affairs according to His Wisdom. Thus He shall decide about you according to His Wisdom and shall enforce it upon you and nobody will be able to hinder it.

هَلْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمُ اللَّهُ فِي ظُلَلٍ مِنَ الْغَمَامِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ وَقُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ ۚ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ تُرْجَعُ الْأُمُورُ ﴿٢١٠﴾

(2:210) ***Do they await aught but that Allah should come to them in the***

canopies of bright cloud and the angels; and the matter is decreed away; and all matters are returned to Allah:

ẓulal is plural of *ẓullah* which means "anything used for shade," like canopy, awning, tent.

Apparently, the word "angels" is in conjunction with the divine name "God."

almizan.org

The preceding two verses were addressed to the believers (in the second person). This one dramatically changes it to third person and starts addressing the Messenger of God; implying that those who slip up and follow the footsteps of Satan are not worthy of direct address from God. It appears as though they are awaiting a decree by their following the footsteps of Satan and by their disunity and division. And that decree should be that God and the angels come unto them in canopies of cloud, and the matter be decided while they are still unaware of it or without having any pity on them and on their plight; and all matters are returned to God; there is no escape from His judgement and decree.

The context shows that *Do they await aught …* is the description of the threat implied in the previous sentence, *then know that Allah is Mighty, Wise*.

almizan.org

It is self-evident truth, which is also proved by the Qur'an and the *sunnah*, that attributes of the body cannot be used for God, nor can He be described with adjectives of transient things. No such word, phrase or sentence can be used for Him which implies transience, need, deficiency or want. God says: *Nothing whatsoever [is there] like the like of Him* (42:11); and *Allah is He Who is Self-sufficient* (35:15); *Allah is the Creator of everything* (39:62). There are numerous such verses; and all of them are confirmed and decisive ones to which the ambiguous verses should be referred. It is these confirmed verses which guide us towards the correct interpretation of the ambiguous ones. If any verse apparently attributes to God an action or a characteristic of transient things, then it must be referred to the confirmed verses and interpreted in a way which is not below His dignity nor opposed to His beautiful names.

almizan.org

Now here is a verse which attributes the action of "coming" to God. A few other verses also have used this word for Him. *And comes your Lord with the angels arrayed in ranks* (89:22); *then came upon them Allah from whence they did not expect* (59:2); *so Allah came upon their structure from the foundations* (16:26). In all such verses, it is necessary to interpret them

with such meanings which are worthy of Divine sublimity. We may give them the meaning of, let us say, sending His chastisement upon them, surrounding them with His power or wrath. Accordingly, the meaning of *Allah should come to them* in this verse shall be "God should surround them with His power for enforcing His decree on them."

Further, whenever God is pleased to show that the apparent means and the intermediate causes are not independent of the order of God, He discards attributing the action to such causes and means; instead He attributes it to Himself or to His order. He says in one place: *Allah takes the souls at the time of their death* (39:42); while in other places He attributes this action to the angel of death or the angels; *Say, the angel of death … shall cause you to die* (32:11); *Until when death comes to one of you, Our messengers* (that is, angels) *take him away* (6:61). To make it more clear, look how He has declared about the angels that: *only according to His command do they act* (21:27).

Likewise, He says, *Surely your Lord will judge between them* (10:93), *and when the order of Allah came, judgement was given with truth* (40:78).

And the same is the case with the verse under discussion (*Do they await aught but that Allah should come to them in the canopies of bright cloud and the angels*) and the verse *Do they await aught but that the angels should come to them or that the order of your Lord should come* (16:33).

The above verse proves that the verse under discussion, *Allah should come*, also means "the order of God should come." Likewise, in every place where the action attributed to God is below His power and dignity, we may safely say that the word 'order' or 'command' is implied, as the above verses have shown.

This explanation has been accepted by the majority of the commentators of the Qur'an and it is correct. But there is even a deeper and finer meaning which can be understood if one ponders on the Qur'an.

A characteristic which is accompanied by a deficiency, want or imperfection is not attributable to God. But if that characteristic could be separated from that deficiency, want or imperfection, then there is no reason why it cannot be attributed to God, provided it is suitable for His sublimity and perfection. The word "coming" creates in our mind a picture of a body gradually moving and shortening the distance between itself and another body till it reaches quite near to that. If we can remove the material characteristics from this meaning, there will remain the idea

of "nearness," with the disappearance of any obstruction in between. In that case, it would be quite correct to use this word for God literally, not metaphorically. Accordingly, God should come to them would mean that there would remain no curtain between His creatures and His judgement about them.

Anyhow, this verse contains the threat which was implied in the preceding sentence, then know that God is Mighty, Wise. This threat may be about the chastisement awaiting them in the Hereafter, as it is in the similar verse: *Do they await aught but that the angels should come to them or that the order of your Lord should come* (16:33), which, as its context shows, is clearly about the events of the Hereafter.

Or, it may be about something expected to happen in this world, as may be seen in the verses of Sūrah Yūnus (Ch. 10): *so when their apostle came, the matter was decided with justice, and they shall not be dealt with unjustly. And they say: when this promise will come to pass, if you are truthful … Say: Do you see if His chastisement overtakes you by night or by day, what is there of it that the guilty hasten for?* (10:47-50). The same is the implication of the verses, 30:30-36, and the verse, *How many a town, which was unjust, We did destroy and We raised another people after it?* (21:11).

The chastisement of this world is because this world is a foretaste of the life Hereafter, where every aspect of this world would appear more perfectly and completely.

And it is possible that the promised punishment would be in both worlds together.

In any case, the words, in the canopies of bright cloud would be interpreted according to the place where the promised punishment would be meted out.

… and the matter is decreed away; and all matters are returned to Allah: The matter is decreed away by God, but His name is not mentioned to show His Greatness. There are many examples of such deletion in the Qur'an.

almizan.org

Examining Narrations

(1) Many traditions have been written concerning verse 2:168 (*O men! Eat the lawful and good things out of what is in the earth; and do not follow the footsteps of Satan …*) which support the meaning given by us of following the footsteps of Satan.

(2) Some traditions say that "submission" means the love and obedience of the Prophet and his progeny (*wilāyah*). Such traditions give an example of a general meaning.

(3) There is a tradition from Imam al-Riḍā about the words of God, *Do they await aught but that Allah should come to them in the canopies of bright cloud and the angels*: He said: "God says: *Do they wait aught but that God should come to them with the angels in the canopies of bright clouds*. Like this it was revealed." And he said, about the word of God; A*nd comes your Lord with the angels arranged in ranks* (89:22), that: "Surely, God cannot be described with attributes of coming and going. Elevated is He from transferring from one place to another. Verily, it means, 'And comes the command of your Lord with the angels arranged in ranks.' " (*al-Tawḥīd* and *Maʿānī al-akhbār*)

Author's comment: The words of the Imam at the beginning of the interpretation, "God says," do not mean the actual word or recitation of the verse. The word "says" here stands for "means." The interpretation given in this tradition is the same which we have already explained, that "coming of God" means coming of His command. The Angels do whatever they do, and come down whenever they come down, by the command of God. He says about angels: *Nay! They are honored servants; they do not precede Him in speech and [only] according to His commandment do they act* (21:27); *and He sends down the angels with the spirit by His commandment* (16:2).

The verse begins with an interrogation which here stands for denial and disapproval. It means that "they do not await" or "they should not await." But some people have said that this denial and disapproval is comprehensive and refutes not only their awaiting but even the thing awaited. In other words, it means that they do not await aught but an impossible thing—that God should come to them in the canopies of cloud as one body comes to another body, and that the angels should come with Him and He should order them and forbid them. Obviously such a thing is impossible; and the aim of the verse would be to hint that these people cannot mend their ways by these exhortations and sermons.

But this meaning does not agree with the context of the verse. It has been explained that all these verses have one context. Therefore, this verse also is about the condition of the believers. And the believers cannot be condemned in the suggested manner. Apart from that if God had meant

to show that the thing awaited was impossible or beneath His sublimity, He would have followed it with some words to show that it was so. And we find that it is the custom of the Qur'an everywhere on such occasions. For example: *And those who do not hope of our meeting say: Why have not angels been sent down upon us, or [why] do we not see our Lord? Certainly they think too high of themselves and have revolted [in] a great revolt* (25:21); *And they say: The Beneficent [Allah] has taken to Himself a son! Glory be to Him!* (21:26).

Apart from that, what would be, in this case, the significance of the words, *in the canopies of bright cloud*? And what would the subsequent words mean?

Other Narrations (Day of Return)

This last verse has variously been interpreted in the traditions of the imams of Ahl al-Bayt as referring to the Day of Resurrection (al-ʿAyyāshi from Imam al-Bāqir) or the Day of Return (the *rajʿah*) (al-Ṣadūq from al-Sādiq) or the Reappearance of Imam al-Mahdī (al-ʿAyyāshī from Imam al-Bāqir with two chains).

And there are many such cases where a verse has been interpreted by them as referring to the Day of Resurrection in one tradition, and to the Day of Return in another, and to the Reappearance of Imam al-Mahdī in yet another one. It is because all these meanings are inter-related, so much so that they can be said to be basically one. As the people have not gone deep into the subject of the Resurrection and have not looked into it in the light of the Qur'an they have gone their separate ways about these traditions. Some have discarded them altogether, even though there are probably more than five hundred traditions on its various aspects; some have interpreted them according to their own views even though the wordings of the traditions are very clear and explicit. A third group quotes these traditions and refrains from giving any opinion—these people are the most reasonable of all.

The non-Shia Muslims believe that Imam al-Mahdī will appear; they have narrated *mutawātir* traditions about it from the Prophet, but they reject the idea of the *rajʿah* and say that this belief is a peculiarity of the Shias. And in these days some people, claiming to be Shia, also have rejected this belief, saying that it has been foisted into Shīʿism by the Jews and some nominal Muslims like ʿAbdullāh b. Sabāʾ and his companions.

One of them tried to refute this belief by intellectual argument, the gist of which is as follows:

"It is a special grace of God that a living person is not given death until he reaches the perfection of the life and all his potentialities are converted into achievements. If after death he is again sent back to this world it would be retrogression, a backward step from accomplishment to potentiality, and it is impossible, except when a truthful informer tells us about it, that is, God or any of His Representatives, as He has informed us concerning the events of Moses, Jesus, Abraham (peace be on them all) and others. But we have not been told by Him or them anything about *al-rajʿah*. And the evidence put by the believers in *al-rajʿah* is not complete."

After saying this he went on to claim about each and every tradition that it was weak—without knowing the difference between the correct ones and the defective ones. The poor man did not realize that this argument is not a rational one at all. Its first part refutes its second part. If some thing is impossible by nature it would remain impossible without any exception. An "impossible" idea would not be turned into "possible" just because a truthful informer said so. Anybody who said about an impossibility that it became a possibility, would not be "truthful." And if he was supposed to be really truthful then that thing would not have been an impossibility in the first place. Would we say that he was truthful if he were to say that one is not a half of two, or that a truthful person was at the same time a liar?

This much about the consistency of his argument. Now, we come to his argument that (1) All people die when they reach the perfection of the life, and when their potentialities are converted into achievements; (2) What has attained achievement cannot be turned back to potentiality; (3) Therefore, a dead man cannot be returned to this life.

In this argument, the second premise is correct; the first is not. It is not "all" people, but only "some," who die after attaining perfection and converting their potentialities into achievements. A man, who completes his natural span of life and dies from old age, may be said to have reached the last stage of his perfection. But what about another man who prematurely dies of an epidemic or fatal sickness, or is killed? Can it be claimed that he had already reached the last stage of his potential perfection? The answer is 'No.' Therefore, it cannot be said that it is impossible for such persons to be returned to the life of this world. Now it is obvious that his argument is neither comprehensive nor correct. We can think of many

cases where it might be possible for a dead person (even if he had died after attaining his perfection) to be sent back to this world; for example, a man in his first life had a potential for a perfection which was not available at that time; he died; then by the progress of society, that perfectness became possible. What is there to prevent his return to this world to achieve that perfection for which he had a potential in the first life? Because it will not be a step backward from perfection to potentiality; it will be progress from potential to perfection.

There are other examples, but this is not the place to go into the details of this subject.

As regards his argument against individual traditions, it has two serious defects: (1) These traditions are *mutawātir*, in their meaning, from the imams of Ahl al-Bayt—so much so that non-Shīʿite Muslims have counted the belief of *al-rajʿah*, from the very early days of Islam, as one of the special beliefs of the Shia and their imams - and a *mutawātir* matter cannot be refuted even if the individual traditions be really defective, or weak, or arguable. (2). There are many verses revealed on this subject and many traditions which are complete in their meaning and reliable in their chains. We shall mention them when we come to the relevant verses like: *And on the day when We will gather from every people a party from among those who rejected Our signs, then they shall be formed into groups* (27:83). There are other verses to prove this belief.

Apart from these specific verses, there are others which imply this meaning. For example, the words of God which come shortly after the verse under discussion: *Or do you think that you will enter the Garden while yet has not come upon the like of which came upon those who have passed before you* (2:214). And one of the things which came upon previous nations was that some of their dead were resurrected, and lived again in this world, as the Qur'an narrates concerning the stories of Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Ezra, Armia and others. And the Messenger of God has said: "By Him in Whose hand is my soul! Most certainly you shall follow the traditions of those who were before you, as in a pair of shoes the one tallies with the other, and as one flea looks like another, until you will not miss their path, nor will they miss yours; (and this means) the traditions of the Israelites."

Moreover, these matters are among the reports of the great events of the latter days, foretold by the imams of Ahl al-Bayt; these prophecies

were preserved by reporters and narrators in books which were written and copied centuries before the events; and every day we see some of its parts fulfilled in exactly the same way without any addition or subtraction. This compels us to believe that the remaining part of those prophecies (including *al-rajʿah*) must be true.

Now we come back to the topic in hand. We were discussing why a single verse is sometimes explained as referring to the Day of Resurrection and sometimes as describing *al-rajʿah* or the reappearance of Imam al-Mahdī. It appears from the characteristics and details of the Day of Resurrection, mentioned in the Qur'an, that it will be a day when no intermediate cause will hinder one from the signs of God; there will remain no veil on the face of truth. All illusions will vanish and the signs of God will appear in their perfect manifestation.

That day could exist side by side with this world, but it is obvious from the Qur'an and *sunnah* that human beings, that is, this species of homo sapiens who are descended from Adam and his wife, will become extinct in this world and only then will this great day dawn upon them.

The life of this world and the life of the Resurrection can exist side by side for different groups and species. The life of the period between death and the Day of Resurrection (*barzakh*) exists for our dead side by side with our life on this earth; neither does our life interfere with theirs, nor theirs with ours. God says: *By Allah! Most certainly We sent [messengers] to nations before you, but Satan made their deeds fair seeming to them; so he is their guardian today and for them is a painful punishment* (16:63).

This, therefore, is the reality of the Day of Resurrection, "the Day on which men shall stand before the Lord of the worlds", "the Day when they shall come forth; nothing concerning them remains hidden from God." That is why sometimes even death is called Resurrection, because the veil of intermediate causes is lifted from the imagination of the dead person. (Imam) ʿAlī has said: "Whoever dies his resurrection begins." This subject will be explained, God willing in its appropriate place.

The traditions which prove *al-rajʿah* in spite of their large number, are one in their essence. They show that the world is proceeding towards a day when the signs of God will appear in their perfect manifestation; man will not disobey God, but shall worship Him with a sincere and pure heart, untainted by the desires of this world; and he will not be deceived by Satan. At that time some dead persons—some friends of God and some

of His enemies—shall be returned to the world again, and the truth will be separated from the falsehood.

It appears from above that the Day of Return (*al-rajʿah*) shall be one of the stages of the Day of Resurrection. But it will be a lesser manifestation, because there shall remain, at that time, the possibility, to a certain extent, of evil and mischief, which will be impossible on the Day of Resurrection.

And that is the reason why in some traditions the same verses have been said to be related concerning the reappearance of Imam al-Mahdī. It is because at his re-appearance also the truth will be manifested perfectly, though it will be less than on the Day of "Return."

There are traditions narrated from the imams of Ahl al-Bayt that "The days of God are three: the Day of reappearance, and the Day of Return, and the Day of Resurrection." Some of them say that "The days of God are three: the Day of Death, and the Day of Return, and the Day of Resurrection."

The three days are one in their nature but different in degrees. It is because of this oneness of essence that a single verse is at different times interpreted by all three days.

The above discussion clearly shows that the Day of Return is not only possible, but a reality; and those who reject it have no reason to refute it.

almizan.org

Verses 211-212

سَلْ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ كَمْ آتَيْنَاهُمْ مِنْ آيَةٍ بَيِّنَةٍ ۗ وَمَنْ يُبَدِّلْ نِعْمَةَ اللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا
جَاءَتْهُ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ ﴿٢١١﴾ زُيِّنَ لِلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا الْحَيَاةُ الدُّنْيَا وَيَسْخَرُونَ
مِنَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ۘ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّقَوْا فَوْقَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ ۗ وَاللَّهُ يَرْزُقُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ بِغَيْرِ
حِسَابٍ ﴿٢١٢﴾

(2:211-212) ***Ask the children of Israel how many a clear sign We gave them; and whoever changes the favor of Allah after it has come to him, then surely Allah is severe in requiting [evil]. The life of this world is made to seem fair to those who disbelieve; and they mock those who believe; but those who guard [against evil] shall be above them on the Day of Resurrection; and Allah provides with sustenance whom He pleases without measure.***

Commentary

Ask the children of Israel how many a clear sign We gave them; and whoever changes the favor of Allah after it has come to him, then surely Allah is severe in requiting [evil]: It reconfirms and emphasizes the threat contained in (2:209), that God shall seize the sinners, in the manner of the One who is Mighty and Powerful. It says: These Israelites are within your sight and hearing. They were the people to whom God gave the Book and the rule and prophethood and territory; and provided them with good things and made them excel other nations. Ask them how many a clear sign We gave them; and then see from when they started and where they went. They changed the words of God from their places; they followed some self invented things in opposition to God, His Book and His signs. And all this was done in revolt after they were given the knowledge. Then God punished them with. the most severe punishment: They went astray, became disunited, disagreed among themselves; they unlawfully ate the property of their brethren; their power was gone, their happiness

vanished; and humiliation and wretchedness were stamped upon them in this world, and the chastisement of the Hereafter is more humiliating and then they shall not get any help.

This is the tradition of God: whoever changes the favor of God and uses it wrongfully, God surely chastises him and of course God is severe in chastisement.

The sentence, *whoever changes the favor of Allah … then surely Allah is severe in requiting,* gives the general principle and describes the unchangeable habit of God, so that the hearers may know the firm decree of God in such cases.

The life of this world is made to seem fair to those who disbelieve; and they mock those who believe: It explains the reason why the Israelites and the people like them went astray. The main reason is that the life of this world seems alluring to them. When materialism allures someone, it encourages him to fulfill the lust and desire of his heart and to satisfy his sensuous appetite; it makes him forget all truth and reality. The only aim of such a man remains to get whatever he can from this world status, dignity, wealth, beauty, and so forth. He makes use of everything to reach this goal—and 'everything' includes religion. Thus, he misuses religion to gain privilege and distinction. Religion becomes a means of honoring the leaders and the bosses and bestowing on them the prestige befitting their status and place in the world; it encourages the common man to seek nearness to those leaders, not to God; it allows them to find ways to seek the favors of these nobles and leaders. This we see in the Muslim *ummah* today, just as it was seen in the Israelites before.

Those who disbelieve (*kufr* translated here as disbelief) is apparently used in the Qur'an in its literal meaning, that is, to hide. In this general meaning it is comprehensive; it includes "disbelief " as well as "hiding the truth." The life of this world is made to seem fair not to the disbelievers only but to them also who hide any religious truth or change any religious favors. Accordingly, such a man also is hider of truth (*kāfir*) who has been allured by the beauty of this life, and he also should prepare himself for the severe punishment.

… but those who guard [against evil] shall be above them on the Day of Resurrection; and Allah provides with sustenance whom He pleases without measure: "Those who believe" in the preceding sentence has been changed in this sentence to *those who guard themselves [against evil]*. It

is to emphasize that mere belief (*īmān*) without *taqwā* (guarding oneself against evil; piety, fear of God) is of no use.

almizan.org

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verse 213

كَانَ النَّاسُ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً فَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ النَّبِيِّينَ مُبَشِّرِينَ وَمُنْذِرِينَ وَأَنْزَلَ مَعَهُمُ
الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ لِيَحْكُمَ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ فِيمَا اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ ۚ وَمَا اخْتَلَفَ فِيهِ إِلَّا
الَّذِينَ أُوتُوهُ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا جَاءَتْهُمُ الْبَيِّنَاتُ بَغْيًا بَيْنَهُمْ ۖ فَهَدَى اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لِمَا
اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ مِنَ الْحَقِّ بِإِذْنِهِ ۗ وَاللَّهُ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ إِلَىٰ صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ ﴿٢١٣﴾

(2:213) ***Mankind was but one people; so Allah sent the prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners, and He sent down with them the book with the truth, so that it might judge between the people in that in which they had differed. And none differed about it but the very people who were given it, after clear signs had come to them, revolting among themselves; whereupon Allah guided, by His will, those who believed to the truth about which they differed. And Allah guides whom He pleases to the straight path.***

Introduction

This verse explains why religion was promulgated and mankind obliged to follow it, and why differences occurred in it.

Mankind, having been created with a natural urge to remain together and cooperate with each other, were in the beginning one single group. Then occurred differences about the acquisition of the necessities of life. These differences could only be settled by creating laws to give each one his right and to make him respect the rights of others. God has ordained the law and sent it down as religion, accompanied by good tidings of reward for those who obey and a warning of punishment for the offenders. This religion was made perfect by the institution of worship. All this was accomplished by sending the prophets and the messengers.

After that, people differed again—this time about the knowledge of religion, or about matters concerning the beginning and end of mankind. Thus, religious unity was disrupted and various groups appeared on the

scene, and their differences contaminated the other aspects of life.

These second differences only occurred because of the revolt of the very people who were given the book, after the fundamentals and characteristics of religion had been fully explained to them and the proof of God had been completed for them.

It is clear that there were two differences: First, the difference about worldly gains, which was but natural; second, the difference about matters of religion which was based, not on nature, but on the revolt of mischief-makers. Then God guided the believers to the truth about which they differed; and this guidance was done by His Will; and God guides whomsoever He pleases to the straight path.

The divine religion is the only means of happiness and felicity for the human species, and it keeps life in order. It creates a balance between various human instincts and urges, and keeps them on the middle path, preventing them from going towards either extreme. Thus, there appears the best system and the highest discipline in the human life both of this world and of the Hereafter, the material as well as the spiritual.

This is an outline of the social and religious history of human beings, as given in this verse. The details may be seen in various verses throughout the Qur'an.

How Mankind came into Being

It appears from various verses, found in various places in the Qur'an, that mankind did not developed from any other species—neither from any animal nor from any plant. It is a species which was created by God directly from the earth. There was a time when the sky existed and earth existed with the things of the earth; but there was no man. Then God created a couple, male and female, of this species, and all present human beings are descended from that couple. *Allah says: O men! Surely We created you of a male and a female, and made you into tribes and families, so that you may recognise each other …* (49:13); and He says: *He it is who created you from a single being and of the same [kind] did He make his mate* (7:189); again He says: *as the likeness of Adam; He created him from dust …* (3:59).

The theory of scientists that one species changed into another, and that homosapiens developed from some kind of ape or, going further back, originated from some water animal, is just a hypothesis. A hypothesis is not a definite fact; it is just a supposition made as a basis for reasoning, or

as a starting point for academic investigation. There is no harm in treating it as a reality or as a possibility, because its only function is to provide a basis for scientific research, and to find out whether it can explain the causes and effects of a given matter. It has no more value than that. We will discuss this subject fully under the verse (3:59), *Surely the likeness of Jesus is with Allah as the likeness of Adam; He created him from dust, then said to him 'Be' and he became.*

His Composition from Soul and Body

When God created this species, He created it composed of two parts; a material substance, the body, and a non-material one, the soul or spirit. Man's body and soul remain together during his life in this world; then the body dies, the living soul departs, and thus man returns to his Creator. God says: *And certainly We created man of an extract of clay, then We made him sperm, in a firm resting place, then We made the sperm a clot, then We made the clot a lump of flesh, then We made [in] the lump of flesh bones, then We clothed the bones with flesh, then We did grow it into another creation, so Blessed by Allah, the Best of the creators. Then after that you will most surely die; then surely on the Day of Resurrection you shall be raised* (23:12-16). See at what stage God says, *did grow it into another creation*. The same meaning is found in the verse, *So when I have made him complete and breathed into him of My spirit, then fall down making obedience to him* (38:72). Then we come to the words of God, where He describes the creation of man and goes on to say: *And they said: What! when we have become lost in the earth, shall we [even] then be [returned] into a new creation? Nay! They are disbelievers in the meeting of their Lord. Say: The angel of death, who is given charge of you, shall cause you to die then to your Lord you shall be brought back* (32:10-11).

In this verse, God first mentions the 'argument' of the unbelievers that there was no possibility of being raised to life again because all the limbs and organs of the body disintegrated and turned to dust after death. Then comes the reply that the angel of death causes them to die and fully takes hold of them; they are something different from the mere body; the bodies are lost in the earth but "they" that is, their souls, are neither lost, disintegrated nor dead.

We shall explain in a proper place the teaching of the Qur'an about the soul of man.

His Perception and Connection with Other Things

God made man and gave him perception, and created in him hearing, sight and the heart (wisdom). He has been given the quality of mind which is known as intelligence and thinking power. By those faculties, he looks at the present, finds out about the past and surmises about the future; he has a sort of comprehensive knowledge of the things around him. God says: *[Allah] taught man what he know not* (96:5); *And Allah brought you forth from the wombs of your mothers, you did not know anything, and He gave you hearing and sight and the hearts [wisdom] so that you may give thanks* (16:78); *And He taught Adam all the names …* (2:31).

God has given him such faculties so that he can establish a relation and connection with all things and can derive benefit from all of them; he can establish that connection either directly or through instruments and machines, the aim all the time being to use them to his own advantage. Look at the innumerable discoveries and inventions, and you will know how God has made everything subservient to man. For example, He says: *He it is Who created for you all that is in the earth* (2:29); *And He has made subservient to you whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth, all, from Himself* (45:13).

His Practical Knowledge

The two faculties—intelligence and the ability to exploit other things—produced a third wonderful faculty: to find out new avenues of knowledge and perception, so as to use them in his exploitation of other things to his advantage.

Suppose you were looking at this species of homo sapiens for the first time. You would be overwhelmingly astonished to see how each member of this species used an unlimited amount of knowledge and ideas to make his life comfortable. That knowledge and those ideas were acquired, analyzed, compared and developed either through the five senses, which provided knowledge of the external world, or through the five faculties of the mind, or through the power of thought, using and reusing the knowledge acquired by those senses.

Then if you were to look at that knowledge and perception, you would find that they could easily be divided into two groups. First, that knowledge which had no direct bearing on man's own actions. For example, the perceiving of the earth, the sky, men, horses, and so on, or that four was

an even number, or that water was a liquid. Such percepts are acquired by man's reaction to the world outside his own being. To acquire those percepts, man does not have to have any intention or action on his own part; they are just information of the outside world for which he is not obliged to do anything.

The second group is opposite to the first one. You will hear him saying: This is good; that is bad; this should be done; that must be avoided; justice is good; injustice is evil. Then, also, you might find him thinking about the ideas of ruling and subjection; of mastership and slavery. Such thoughts and percepts have a direct bearing on his actions and activities. All his intentional actions depend on those percepts and knowledge. And, unlike the first group, these percepts do not originate outside his being; they are formed in his mind either involuntarily, by his instinct, or voluntarily, through his own thinking, or feeling. For example, he has a system for digestion and nourishment and another for reproduction. These systems are governed by some inner motivating forces which make him desire what helps in these functions and dislike what hinders him in pursuit of those pleasures. This inner reaction creates in him such emotions and feelings as love, hate, inclination and desire.

These emotions and feelings compel him to think about what is good and what bad, what desirable and what undesirable, what compulsory and what permissible, and so on.

Then taking such ideas as a base, he decides his course of action and uses the things around him accordingly.

It is clear from the above that those ideas, morals or ethics (whatever you call them) have no value unless and until they are acted upon. As mere ideas they are worthless. Therefore, we may call them practical knowledge.

As mentioned above, God inspired man with these morals to prepare him for action and make him ready to exploit the hidden forces of the world: "in order that God might bring about a matter which was to be done." God says: *Our Lord is He who gave to everything its creation, then guided it [to its goal.]* (20:50); *Glorify the name of your Lord, the Most High, Who created, then made complete, and Who made [things] according to a measure, then guided [them to their goal.]* (87:1-3) The guidance, mentioned in these verses, is the general guidance bestowed on every creature, sentient as well as insentient, to lead it to the perfection of its being, and to encourage it to act for its own protection and maintenance.

God says, especially about the man: *And [I swear by] the soul as it is made perfect, and He inspired unto it [about] its vices and its piety* (91:7-8). It shows that man knows about vice and virtue through a divine inspiration which is implanted in his nature. These two percepts—'should do' and 'should not do'—have no existence outside his mind; and perhaps that is why God used the pronoun "Its" (that is, soul's) about vices and piety.

Also, God says: *And this life of the world is nothing but a vain sport and play; and surely the abode of the Hereafter is certainly the life, if they but know* (29:64). Sport or play is in the attitude of the mind only. If the same action were done as a responsibility or as a job, it would loose its charm. Likewise, the aspect of this life—prestige, riches, progress, backwardness, mastership, servitude—are only in the mind of man. These aspects do not exist outside the mind. For example, we say, 'a man who is president' or 'a cloth which is possessed.' Now, 'a man' and 'a cloth' are the things which exist outside the mind of the speaker; but that man's 'presidency' and that cloth's being 'possessed' are not so. These aspects are in the mind only.

His Exploitation of Other Things

To make a long story short, one of these ideas is the belief that men must take all necessary steps to preserve his own life; and because of this belief he makes use of all the materials available to him. He exploits matter to fulfil his needs—the knife to cut, the needle to sew, pots to keep water, ladders to climb and innumerable such tools and machines for their benefit.

Likewise, he uses plants and vegetables for food, clothing, housing, and so on. And subjugates animals to support his own existence; and takes advantage of their meat, blood, hide, hair, wool, tusks, horns, excrement, milk, bones and other such things. He benefits not only from the parts of their bodies, but also from their actions, as he rides a horse or uses the oxen for pulling carts and ploughs.

Man's exploitation does not end here. He goes further and exploits his own kind, subjugating other human beings, or taking advantage of them in other manners, as much as he can.

Man is Social by Nature

But man found, to his chagrin, that other men in their turn wanted to subjugate him in the same way as he was thinking about (subjugating)

them. The result was a mutual understanding that they would take advantage of him as much as he benefited from them. This "give-and-take" prompted men to live in society and to cooperate with each other in their affairs. It necessitated the safeguarding of the rights of every member of that society to keep a balance between their rights and their duties. This is called social justice.

Society and social justice were founded on the unavoidable compulsion of the above-mentioned situation. Had it not been for that compulsion, man would not have agreed to it at all. This is the reality behind the claim that man is social by nature and that he follows the dictates of social justice! The fact is that this sociability and social justice came into being under the compulsion of the mutual tendency to exploit each other.

That is why whenever a man acquires power over his fellows, the dictates of social justice are forgotten; and the mighty one ignores the rights of weaker ones. It is as much true in the case of individuals as in that of nations and states; and this has been going on from the early history of mankind until the present, which is called the age of civilization and freedom!

This has been hinted in the verses: *Surely he [that is, man] is unjust, ignorant* (33:72); *Surely man is created avaricious* (70:19); *Surely man is very unjust, very ungrateful* (14:34); *Nay! Verily man is wont to rebel as he sees himself free from want* (96:6-7).

Had social justice been the primary urge of his nature, most of society would have been overwhelmingly just and equitable. But what we see is always opposite to that. Always the demonstration of 'might is right' comes in front of our eyes; powerful ones coerce weaker ones into subjugation; victors humiliate the vanquished, and exploit them for their own advantage.

Difference Among Human Beings

So, there is the natural instinct to take advantage of others. Then there are the necessary differences among individuals in bodily physique, in habitat, habits, character and things like that, which in their turn create a difference in strength; some become stronger, others weaker. At this stage, the stronger men start ignoring the dictates of social justice and they no longer pay attention to the common weal of the society. The mighty one exploits the weaker one and gives him little in exchange; the victor takes

advantage of the vanquished without giving him any benefit in return. The weak person makes it up by deception and trickery, always waiting for a chance to get the upper hand. And as soon as he gets a chance he avenges himself with a most severe reprisal.

Thus the difference leads to chaos, disorder and disturbance. Humanity comes near to extinction, and happiness and felicity depart from society.

It is this aspect to which the verse under discussion as well as some other verses refer: *And men were naught but a single people then they differed* (10:19); *and they shall continue to differ except those on whom your Lord has mercy* (11:118-119).

This disunity and difference was bound to occur in society. As has already been mentioned, men were different in the build of their bodies and the bent of their minds. Of course, they were all human beings, and to a certain extent their activities and thinking were similar. But at the same time, their feelings, character and condition were different from each other. That resulted in a difference in their ambitions, sins and goals of life, which in its turn motivated them to different types of actions, and finally led to the disruption of the social system.

That disruption and disturbance made it necessary to legislate such comprehensive and fundamental laws as could remove that disturbance, difference and disagreement by, giving each one his due right. Also, it was essential to make people obey those laws.

Nowadays, societies use one of two methods to enforce the law:

(1) Compelling the people to obey laws (which are legislated to make all people share in the means of livelihood and to give everyone what could take him to the perfection of his life) and discarding religious tenets like belief in God and higher moral values. Faith in God is completely eradicated, and morality is made to follow the trends of society. Whatever is liked by a sizeable section of the community is accepted as virtue. One day chastity is held in high regard, the next day it is ridiculed and debauchery becomes the norm of the time. One day, truth is respected, the next day falsity is glorified. One day trustworthiness, the next day embezzlement and so on.

(2) Making people obey laws by character building and by training them to respect the laws—but after removing religion and religious teachings from the training programs.

The first method uses the sheer force of the rulers, the second,

combines force with moral teaching. Apart from the rot that sets into society as a result, both methods are based on ignorance and negate the reality of human existence. Man is created by God; his existence depends on his Master; he came from God and to Him he will return. On his departure from this world, his life will continue in the next world forever and ever without disruption. But the quality of the next life will depend upon this life—how he behaved here, how he maintained his relation with his Creator and which characteristics he developed and which qualities he acquired. If a man builds his life here on the foundation of the rejection of the divinity, he will surely destroy his "self" and ruin his next life.

Let us take the example of a caravan. The company of travellers start for a far away place with sufficient provision for the journey. They camp in a caravanserai for a while, no sooner are they lodged for the night then they start quarrelling among themselves. They do not stop at any misdeed; they fight with each other, murder and defame one another, plunder belongings and commit many other atrocities. Then, appalled by the carnage, they sit together to find a way to save their lives and property. Someone says: "Let us jointly use, and benefit from, all these provisions, and allow every individual a right to enjoy them according to his service to the group. We have nowhere to go from this place. Anyone opposing this scheme will be severely punished." Another person says: "Let us make a law to remove this difference; each of us shall concentrate on building his character; we must behave with kindness towards our companions, we should not deviate from the path of love, gallantry and nobility. Therefore, we should jointly enjoy the provisions which we have. After all, the provisions are for our own use in this very place."

There is no need to point out that both advisers are mistaken. They forget that the whole caravan is still on its way; and that the traveller, in all conditions and at all times, should remember his final destination and manage the affairs of his journey with only one goal in view: "What is the best way of his reaching home?" If he forgets this fundamental truth, there will be nothing left for him but becoming lost in the wilderness, and disaster and death.

A sensible adviser would have advised them with these words: "Use these provisions according to what you need of tonight; save the rest for other stopping places on the way; because your final destination is still very far and you must think to save some of the provisions for use after

reaching home."

Religion Removes the Difference

This is why God created laws, basing them on the belief of the oneness of God, on true faith, on fine character and good deeds. In other words, these laws were made to teach people the reality of life, from the beginning up to its final destination; to make them realize that this life should be spent keeping the next life in view, and that this short life is but a preparation for the next one which will last forever and ever.

It is clear that it is only divine law which is based on knowledge. No other law was ever built on that foundation. God says: *Judgement is not but Allah's; He has commanded that you worship not but Him; this is the right religion, but most people do not know* (12:40). And He says in the verse under discussion: *so God sent the prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners and He sent down with them the book with the truth, so that it might judge between the people in that in which they had differed.* Here the sending of the prophets to bring good tiding and to warn has been joined with sending down the book which contains the laws and rules, so as to remove their differences.

Another verse says: *And they say: There is nothing but our life in this world; we die and live and destroys us not but time ; and they have no knowledge of that, they only conjecture* (45:24). This insistence of theirs was not only to refute belief in the hereafter; its real motive was to wriggle out from the responsibilities which result from that belief. Reason says that, if you believe in the life hereafter, you must make this life subservient to that one; you must worship the Creator and obey the laws ordained by Him which will guide you in all the spheres of life: worship, social dealings, and the penal law. In short, belief in the hereafter makes it obligatory to follow the dictates of religion, to always keep the improvement of the next life in view. That was the reason why the unbelievers rejected that belief and based their social norms on the assumption that there was nothing beyond life in this world.

Again God says: *they do not follow anything but conjecture, and surely conjecture does not avail against the truth at all. Therefore, turn aside from him who turns his back upon Our reminder and does not desire anything but the life of this world. That is the [last] reach of their knowledge …* (53:28-30) In this verse God makes it clear that they base their lives on conjecture

and ignorance, while God invites them to the Abode of Peace and His religion is based on truth and knowledge, and which the Prophet calls them towards what gives them life. God says: *O you who believe! Answer [the call of] Allah and the Messenger when he calls you to that which gives you life …* (8:24). Life which is mentioned in this verse has been explained in the following verses: *Is he who was dead then We raised him to life and made for him a light by which he walks among the people, like unto him whose similitude is that of one in utter darkness whence he cannot come forth?* (6:122); *Is then he who knows that what has been sent down to you from your Lord is the truth, like unto him who is blind? Only those possessed of understanding shall bear in mind* (13:19); *Say, this is my way. I invite [you] unto Allah; with clear sight [are] I and he who follows me; and glory be to Allah, and I am not of polytheists* (12:108); *Say, are those who know and those who do not know alike? Only those possessed of understanding shall bear in mind* (39:9); *… a messenger from among themselves who shall recite to them Thy communications and teach them the Book and the wisdom, and purify them …* (2:129).

There are many verses like these in the Qur'an extolling the virtues of understanding, calling people to acquire knowledge and follow the path of wisdom. It attaches so much importance to knowledge that it has named the pre-Islamic days "the period of Ignorance."

With this background, you will realize how unjust is the claim that religion is based on blind faith and ignorance, and is opposed to knowledge and learning.

This allegation was laid by some scientists. They spent their time in the natural and social sciences and they did not find in these physical sciences anything which could prove anything metaphysical. And they thought that the "non-existence of a proof" is a "proof of non-existence." It is obvious that they were mistaken in that conjecture. Going further, they looked at some myths which some entrenched interests had imposed on the masses in their countries, claiming that it was religion, and which in fact was nothing but polytheism—and God and His Messenger repudiate the polytheists. Then they heard the preaching of priests exhorting the public to accept, without any questioning, the dogma and tenets of that mythical religion.

All these factors led them to declare that religion was against knowledge. But the true religion is too great to encourage ignorance or blind

faith, or to exhort to act without understanding. The true religion never uttered a word without proper guidance or without an illuminating book. [God says:] *And who is more unjust than the one who forges a lie against Allah or gives the lie to the truth when it has come to him?* (29:68).

Difference in Religion Itself

God informs us in this verse (2:213) that differences and disunity in the affairs of society and worldly life were removed for the first time by religion. If there are any laws which are apparently non-religious, they too are based on that first religious teaching.

Then God informs us that later on there occurred differences in the religion itself. These differences were created by the followers of the religion, who were given the clear book and who possessed knowledge of it. It happened because of their revolt, injustice and rebellion. God says: *He has prescribed for you the religion which He enjoined upon Noah, and that which We have revealed to you, and that which We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus, to establish the religion and be not divided there in … And they did not become divided until after the knowledge had come to them, out of rivalry among themselves; and had not a word gone forth from your Lord till an appointed time, certainly the affair would have been decided between them …* (42:13-14).

Also He says: *And mankind was not but a single people, then they differed and had not a word already gone forth from your Lord, the matter would certainly have been decided between them in respect of that concerning which they disagree* (10:19).

The word which had gone forth was the promise given to Adam: *and for you there is in earth an abode and a provision for a [fixed] time* (7:24).

This difference among the followers of religion was based on rebellion and revolt, not on any dictate of nature. The divine religion is based on nature and normally people cannot go astray in a natural thing. Nor can the demand of nature change. God says: *Then set your face upright for religion, in natural devotion [to the truth]—the nature made by Allah in which He has made men; there is no change in the creation of Allah; that is the right [established] religion …* (30:30).

This in short is the foundation upon which this verse is based.

Man After this World

Then God informs us that man shall soon depart from this world and his intermediate station will be a place called *barzakh* (intermediate life), and the final destination is a place called the Hereafter.

His life, after this life, is an individualistic one; there will be no social cooperation, mutual help or partnership. Man shall leave this physical world behind, returning to his Lord and Creator. There shall be no room there for that knowledge which we named earlier 'practical knowledge.' There will be no exploitation or taking advantage of others; no civilization, social "give-and-take," nor any other of the paraphernalia connected with the life of this world. His only companion will be his deeds which he did in this world; he will see the good or bad results of his actions. Reality will become clear to him, and he will clearly know the Great News about which they had differed.

God says: *And We will inherit of him what he says and he shall come to Us alone* (19:80); *And certainly you have come to Us alone as We created you at first, and you have left behind your backs the things which We gave you; and We do not see with you your intercessors about whom you asserted that they were [Allah's] associates in respect to you; certainly the ties between you are now cut off and what you asserted is gone from you* (6:94); *There shall every soul become acquainted with what it sent before and they shall be brought back to Allah, their true Master and what they did fabricate shall escape from them* (10:30); *What is the matter with you that you do not help each other? Nay! On this day they are submissive* (37:25-26); *On the day when the earth shall be changed into a different earth, and the heavens [as well]; and they shall come forth before Allah, the One, the Subduer* (14:48); *And that there is not for man [aught] except what he strives for; and that his striving shall soon be seen; then shall he be recompensed for the fullest recompense* (53:39-41).

These and many such verses clearly show that man's system of life shall change after death. There shall be no cooperation and no striving. There he shall see the result of his striving and the fruits of his actions. All his striving shall appear before him in its true color and he shall be recompensed for it with the fullest measure.

Commentary

Mankind was but one people: *Nās* translated here as 'mankind,' literally

means 'men.' *Ummah* translated here as 'people,' means 'a group of men.' Sometimes it is used for only one man, as in the verses: *Surely Abraham was a people* (ummatan)*, [devoutly] obedient to Allah* (16:120); sometimes for a long period, as in the verse: *and remembered after an* (ummatin) *a long time* (12:45) and in the verse: *And if We hold back from them the punishment until stated period of time* (ummatin maʿdūdatin) (11:8). A fourth usage is for religion, as in the verse: *And surely this your religion is one religion* (ummatukum ummatan wāḥidah) *and I am your Lord, therefore, fear Me* (23:52) and, *Surely this your religion is one 'religion' and I am your Lord, therefore worship Me* (21:92). In both these verses, according to some commentators, the word *ummah* has been used for 'religion.'

The word *ummah* is derived from *amma* (he had an aim); thus it is used for a company of people—not every company, but that which has a single aim, a single goal and a single ambition, and that unity of aim unites all the members, and makes them one people. That is why it is correct to use it for one man as well as for many; the other usages mentioned above are based on that basic meaning.

Anyhow, the sentence obviously refers to the beginning of humanity, when they were united, and lived a simple life and had simple thoughts. There were no differences or any tug-of-war in matters of life or livelihood, nor was there any disagreement about religion or religious matters.

That at that time there was no difference about matters of life is evident from the next sentence, *so Allah sent the prophets … so that it* (the book) *might judge between the people in that in which they had differed*, as it shows that the prophets were sent and the book was revealed to remove differences, because earlier they were one people. Thus the difference in matters of life occurred after the unity. And the proof that at that time there was no difference about matters of religion is seen in the following sentences, *And none differed about it but the very people who were given it … revolting among themselves*, as it shows that the disagreement about religion was started by those who were given the book, which obviously means that it started after the book was revealed.

Experience also supports this. Mankind is continuously climbing the heights of knowledge and thought and ever progressing along the path of learning and culture, year after year, and generation after generation. Thus civilization goes forward day by day, new ways are found to fulfil even the slightest needs, natural and physical obstacles are removed and ever

newer instruments are invented to make life more and more comfortable.

On the other hand, if we retrace our steps, going back towards the early days of humanity, every step will take us to people less and less acquainted with the secrets of life and the mysteries of nature, till we reach early man who knew almost nothing of the possibilities of life except those facts that were self-evident, and who used only a little imagination to gather his means of livelihood by the simplest methods. His food consisted of plants and meat which he obtained by hunting; he lived in caves, and defended himself with sticks and stones.

It is clear that a people who lived such a primitive life would not become entangled in any considerable disagreement; nor could there occur among them any lasting differences. They were in a way like a flock of sheep, everyone following the others, all remaining together for the purpose of food and abode.

This was in the very beginning. But, as we have described earlier, man had the natural urge to take advantage of others. And although the need to cooperate with each other in gathering the necessities of life compelled people to remain together, it did not prevent them from quarrelling with, and getting better of, each other. And every day man acquired new skills, and every new experience added to his store of knowledge. Whenever he used a newly-acquired expertise, it opened new avenues of progress and dexterity for him. Also, because of the dictates of nature, some individuals were stronger while others were weaker. Those who were stronger in body or mind tried to reduce others to virtual subjugation, taking more from them than they gave them in return. That was the beginning of the differences, which was only natural as it was based on the natural urge to take advantage of others, although it had been the same urge which had led to the creation of society.

It may seem strange that the same natural urge compelled men to remain together, on one hand, and led them to quarrel and find differences, on the other. But there is nothing objectionable in the conflict between two natural demands, provided there is a third faculty above them to judge and decide, and to create a balance between them. For example, there is hunger which urges man to fill his stomach with whatever he can, even when the digestive system cannot tolerate it. There is a conflict between hunger and the power of digestion, but always there is the mind and reason to judge and decide between these two demands. It gives to each power only that

which does not hinder the activities of the other.

The conflict between the two natural urges of marshalling others to one's service and cooperating with others as a single society is of the same category, because, God decreed to remove that conflict by sending the prophets and revealing to them the book to decide and judge in the matters of their differences and contentions.

This is the correct interpretation of this verse. Unfortunately, some exegetes have interpreted it in various other ways, but none of those interpretations conform to the meaning of the verse.

First interpretation: The verse says that all men were on the right path, because the differences began only when the book was sent down to them, and the followers of the book differed, revolting among themselves.

Comment: This man did not realize that the verse describes two conflicts, not one; and we have already explained this. Also he did not pause to think that if all men were already on the right path and there was no difference, then what was the justification of sending the prophets and revealing the book and thus giving them an opportunity to differ among themselves by revolt, and thus creating chaos in the world, sowing the seed of unbelief and sin, debauchery and immorality?

Second interpretation: Mankind was one group in the meaning that all had gone astray. Otherwise, God would not have said, *so Allah sent the prophets …*

Comment: This man did not ponder upon the verse with a clear mind. This going astray, to which he referred in this interpretation, has been indicated by God in His words, *whereupon Allah guided … those who believed to the truth about which they differed*. It means that this difference and going astray had started because of the bad motives of the followers of the book and the scholars of religion after the book was revealed and its signs were clarified for people. If people had already gone astray, if they had already been treading the path of disbelief, hypocrisy, sin and immorality, before the coming of the prophets and the book, how could it be attributed to the followers of the book and the scholars of religion?

Third interpretation: Mankind (*nās*) in this verse refers to the Israelites only. God says somewhere else about them: *but they did not differ until after knowledge had come to them, revolting among themselves* (45:17). As the same words have been used in the verse under discussion, it means that the people referred to are the same.

Comment: But it is proof which has no validity at all. If in one verse, a virtue or vice is attributed to a certain nation, it does not mean that, that characteristic is confined to that nation or is its special characteristic.

Fourth interpretation: Mankind means Adam; and the verse says that Adam was one group on the right path; then his descendants differed among themselves, *so Allah sent the prophets …*

Comment: But the context of the whole verse disagrees with such a meaning. It is not possible to accept even a part of this interpretation, let along the whole.

Fifth interpretation: "Was" (*kāna*) in this sentence should not be taken as a past tense; rather it stands for "is" and shows a continuously existing reality, as in the words of God: *and Allah is* (kāna) *Mighty, Wise* (48:19). In short, it means that mankind is by nature one group, because people are dictated by nature to remain together, and as cooperation and sociability is their natural urge, they have to live together in a society. But this togetherness breeds difference and conflicts. Therefore, God sent the prophets and revealed the book to judge about that difference.

Comment: There are three defects in this interpretation:

First: It supposes that sociability and cooperation is the primary natural urge. But it has been explained that it is not so. The primary urge is to take advantage of others and use them for one's own benefit. It is only when a man finds out that others have the same design about him that he comes to a compromise with them, and this "give-and-take" results in cooperation. So this cooperation is based on compromise, not on any natural urge. The Qur'an also goes against that supposition, as has been explained earlier.

Second: The mere fact that man is "social by nature," does not justify sending the prophets and revealing the book, unless it is mentioned that this "natural sociability" leads to conflict and disturbance. In other words, this interpretation makes it necessary to read this verse in this way: "Mankind is but one people (but that oneness breeds conflict) so God sent the prophets …" But the said exegete does not accept that 'conflict' is implied in this sentence.

Third: This interpretation mentions only one conflict. But the verse clearly shows two conflicts—first, before the revelation of the book, when the differences were common to all people (so that it might judge between the people in that in which they had differed); and, second, after

its revelation, which was confined to the religious scholars, and not common to all people (*And none differed about it* (that is, about the book) *but the very people who were given it … revolting among themselves*). Thus there were two differences, one was after receiving the knowledge and based on revolt, the other was not so.

… so Allah sent the prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners: *Baʿth* literally means to revive, to awaken, to bring back to life. Its past tense, *baʿatha* has been translated here as 'sent down,' only to make the meaning clear; otherwise, 'sent down' is the translation of *arsala*, not of *baʿatha*.

Why did God use here the word *baʿatha* (awakened, revived) here and not *arsala* (sent down)? The early period of mankind, which is being discussed in this sentence, was a period of quietness and inactivity. And it was more relevant to say that they were awakened and revived than that someone was sent to them.

Perhaps that is also the reason why those representatives of God are here referred to as prophets (*nabiyyīn*) and not messengers (*mursalīn*). It has been described in the first volume that the purpose of raising the prophets and revealing the books was to explain the truth to people, and to teach them the realities of their existence, making them aware of the fact that they have been created by their Lord, God Who has no colleague or partner in His divinity or power; and that they are to return to Him and then shall be resurrected and brought back to life on a great day; that presently they have halted in a mid way station which has no more reality than a sport or play. Having realized this basic fact, they must keep it before their eyes in all situation and all their actions, always bearing in mind where they have come from, where they are, and what is their destination. This waking up to the realities of life is more appropriately described by the word *nabiyyīn* (prophets) because *nabī* means "one who has the news (*nabāʾ*)."

Allah sent the prophets: The authority and responsibility for sending the prophets is on God alone. It is only He Who sends them. It proves their sinlessness in receiving the revelation and explaining it to the people. (This topic is described in detail at the end of this commentary)

The prophets were sent as bearers of good tidings and as warners. They brought the good news of the mercy of God, and His pleasure and paradise for those who believe in Him and guard themselves against

evil. And they gave the warning of the chastisement from God, and His displeasure and Fire, to those who reject the truth and commit sins. The two aspects of prophethood—good tidings and warnings—are the most effective ways of keeping an average person on right path and making the prophetic mission a success, although some righteous servants of God do good and desist from evil only for the sake of their Lord without thinking about any reward or punishment.

… and He sent down with them the book with the truth, so that it might judge between the people in that in which they had differed: *Kitāb* is on the paradigm of *fiʿāl* and means 'the written.' The word generally refers to anything written by pen. But as the covenants and decrees are confirmed through writing, it is not infrequently used for compulsory and obligatory commands, and for every confirmed fact or idea which is irrefutable. And it has been used in this meaning in numerous verses of the Qur'an. The Qur'an itself is called the book (*kitāb*) with this very meaning; otherwise, it is the talk of God. It is said in the Qur'an: *[It is] a book* (kitābun) *which We revealed to you, abounding in blessings …* (38:29); *Surely, prayer is [compulsory] on the believers* (kitāban mawqūtā)*, a timed ordinance* (4:103).

The words, in that in which they had differed show that the meaning is, "Mankind was but one people, then they differed, so God sent the prophets …"

The definite article "the" (*al*) in 'the book' (*al-kitāb*) indicates either the genus of book (and, accordingly refer to all divine books revealed to the prophets) or a known (and implied) book. In later case, it would refer to the book of Noah, because God says in the Qur'an: *He has prescribed for you of the religion what He enjoined upon Noah and that which We have revealed unto you and that which We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus …* (42:13). This verse describes the grace .and favor of God by saying that the shariah (Law) sent down to the Muslims combines in itself what was given piecemeal to the previous prophets and over and above it contains many new features revealed to the prophet of Islam. It means that the Law was given only to those great prophets who are named here: Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad (peace be on them all).

Now, the verse under discussion (*He sent down with them the book …*) clearly says that the shariah was given in written form. Look at these two verses (2:213 and 42:13) together and you will see that:

First: Noah was given a book containing the Law, and that book is surely referred to in this verse, *He sent down with them the book* either alone (if "the" is for a known and implied book) or with other divine books (if "the" denotes the genus of the book).

Second: The book of Noah was the first divine book containing the shariah. Had there been any other such book before him it would have contained a Law to judge between the people, and God would have mentioned that shariah in verse (42:13).

Third: The period referred to in the sentence, *Mankind was but one people,* was the era before the mission of Noah and his book decided and judged between the people in their differences.

And none differed about it but the very people who were given it, after clear signs had come to them, revolting among themselves: It has been explained that it refers to the difference about the matters of religion among the followers of the religion. As the religion is based on the nature of man as created by God (*Then set your face uprightly for the [right] religion—the nature made by Allah in which He had made men*—30:30), God attributed these differences to the revolt of the followers and the scholars of the religion.

The words, *but the very people who were given it,* indicate the origin of the religious differences about the meaning of the book. It does not say that every one who goes astray or follows a false religion is a rebel, although it is true that he has lost his way. God would not accept the excuses of a rebel; but He might accept the entreaties of those who were confused and could not find the right path. God says: *The way [to blame] is only against those who do injustice to the people and revolt in the earth unjustly …* (42:42); *And others have confessed evil [one]; may be Allah will turn to them [in mercy]; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful … And others are made to wait Allah's command—whether He will chastise them or whether He will turn [in mercy], to them; And Allah is All-knowing, All-wise* (9:102-106); *Except the weakened ones from among the men and the women and the children who have not in their power the means nor do they find a way; so these, it may be, Allah will pardon them, and Allah is the Clement, Oft forgiving* (4:98-99)

Moreover, nature may go hand in hand with forgetfulness or doubt, but it cannot with revolt and intentional transgression. That is why the verse uses the words of revolt especially for those who knew the book and for

whom the signs were made clear. God says: *And [as to] those who disbelieve in and reject My signs, they are the inmates of the Fire, in it they shall abide* (2:39). There are numerous verses of this meaning in the Qur'an; and in all of them the disbelief has been made conditional on the rejection of the signs of God and then it is followed by the threat of punishment.

In short, this sentence shows that the second differences began because of the rebellion of the scholars of the book, after they were given knowledge of it.

… whereupon Allah guided, by His will, those who believed to the truth about which they differed. And Allah guides whom He pleases to the straight path: The truth about which they differed explains the subjects of the differences and that it was the truth with which the book was sent down ("the book with the truth").

At this juncture, God guided the believers to the truth in both differences: Differences in affairs of this life, and differences in the matters of religion. The guidance of the believers was by His will, because they could not make it binding upon God to guide them, for the simple reason that there is none to impose upon Him. It is only He Himself who takes upon Himself whatever He pleases. Therefore, the guidance was by His will; if He were not pleased, He would not have willed and would not have guided.

Accordingly, the sentence, *And Allah guides whom He pleases to the straight path* gives the reason of "by His will." He guided them because it is His discretion to guide whom He pleases, nobody can impose upon Him to guide this or to guide that. And He surely willed to guide the believers to the straight path.

Looking at the verses as a whole, we come to know the following:

First: The definition of religion: Religion is a way of life which contains the good of this world in a manner that ensures perfection of the next life—the life that is the real and eternal one near to God.

It means that the shariah must contain the necessary laws for this worldly life and one's livelihood.

Second: Originally religion was promulgated to remove natural differences; then it was perfected to remove both types of differences; then it was perfected to remove both types of difference—the natural ones and the unnatural ones emanating from the rebellion of religious scholars.

Third: Religion goes on perfecting itself until its laws cover all the possible needs and eventualities of life. When it reaches that stage of

perfection it is finalized and no other religion comes after it. Conversely, if a religion is the final one, it must be comprehensive enough to cover all eventualities and fulfil all the needs of life. God said: *Muḥammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the Last of the prophets …* (33:40); *and We revealed unto you the book, explaining clearly everything …* (16:89); *and most surely it is a mighty book; falsehood shall not come to it from before it nor from behind it …* (41:41-42).

Fourth: Every succeeding shariah was more perfect than the preceding one.

Fifth: Why were the prophets sent and the books revealed? In other words, what was the reason for the prophetic mission? Man, by his nature, develops towards differences in matters of life, as much as he progresses towards social cooperation. As it is nature itself which leads to differences, it is not capable of removing them. How can it repel a thing when it is forcefully pulling it towards itself? Therefore, God took it upon Himself to remove that conflict; and He sent the prophets with the laws to lead men to their perfection—real perfection which is a part of their creation. God says: *Our Lord is He Who gave to everything its creation, then guided it [to its goal]* (20:50). It shows that God completes the creation of everything and guides it to its perfection. The creation of man is completed when he is guided to his perfection in both lives. Also He says: *All do We aid—these as well as those—out of the bounty of your Lord; and the bounty of your Lord is not confined* (17:20). It means that God aids out of His bounty everyone who is in need of His aid in his life and existence; He gives him what he deserves. His bounty is neither confined nor limited, so far as God is concerned. If there is any limitation, it is from man's side, not from his Creator's.

Obviously, man cannot perfect himself, because it is his own nature which is the case of this defect. As it is nature which leads to the conflict, and as that nature is unable to mend what it has damaged, the reform (if there is to be any) must come from somewhere outside nature—it must come from the Creator; and it came in the form of prophethood guided by divine revelation. The sending of the prophets for this reform and removal of conflict has been given the name of *baʿth* (awakening, revival); and never has this verb been attributed, in the Qur'an, to anyone except God, although the prophetic calls, like everything else, have some connection with their place and time.

Prophethood is a divine (say, if you will, unseen) condition which has the same relation to general human perception and activity as wakefulness has to sleep. The prophet receives the knowledge by which the conflicts and differences of human life can be removed. This perception received from the unseen is called, in the language of the Qur'an 'revelation'; and the quality and condition of receiving that revelation is called 'prophethood.'

Therefore, the reason for initiating the prophetic mission rests on the following factors:

(1) Human nature leads man to social cooperation;
(2) At the same time it creates friction and conflict;
(3) Nature itself cannot remove that conflict;
(4) Therefore, a force outside of nature, should intervene to remove that conflict;
(5) God completes creation and in His mercy, has taken it upon Himself to guide everything to its perfection;
(6) As a result of that undertaking, He sent prophets and revealed to them the book to reform human society.

All these factors are proved by reason and experience.

Never has man desisted from exploiting others to his advantage; never has that exploitation, after action and reaction, failed to create a society; never has any society been free from conflict; never has that conflict been removed without social laws; and never has human wisdom been able to make such laws which could cut away all the roots of conflict.

Look at the present world. See the chaos in human society, the degradation of moral values, the never-ending chain of wars, the destruction of crops and cattle, the fighting which exterminate millions and millions of people, the autocracies, the subjugation of nations, the abasing of the human spirit, the usurping of lives and property; you will find all these and much more. And it is happening in this, the twentieth century, the century of civilization, the age of progress, the era of culture and science. What could have been the situation in the old day—the age of ignorance and darkness?

That the teaching and training of religion, emanating from the prophets and revelation, have the ability to eradicate this conflict is proven by reason and experience.

Reason: Religion calls people to real knowledge, high ethics, and noble deeds. Humanity can reach the highest peak of perfection by following

such teachings.

Experience: Islam has proved it during the short period when it had control over Muslim society, as will be explained, God willing, in a proper place.

Sixth: The religion, which has been sent as the last of all religions, proves that humanity has reached the final stage of its completion and perfection. That is why the Qur'an has decreed that prophethood has come to its end with Muḥammad. His religion will never be abrogated, and his shariah will remain in force till the end of the world. It means that human perfection, individual as well as collective, shall always, remain within the limits of the laws ordained by Islam. There can never arise a situation for which Islam has no guidance.

It is a prophecy of the Qur'an confirmed by the history of humanity in the last fourteen centuries. Mankind has, in this period, progressed tremendously, and reached unimaginable heights in the field of the material and physical sciences. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about his ethics and morality. It has not progressed even one step since that time. Rather, it could be claimed that in this respect it has taken many steps backwards. Thus humanity has not progressed as a whole. It is a lop-sided development. Man has strengthened his body, neglecting his soul, which has become weaker.

It is clear from above that the laws of Islam have as much relevance in this era as they had fourteen centuries ago. And they will not loose their relevancy even in the future.

Some people say: The laws of religion were made for the reform of man and the good of society. If society changes, and climbs further towards the summit of perfection, religion and its law also must change, to stay in step with the changing society. It is no secret that the difference between this age and that when the Qur'an came down and Islamic laws were promulgated is far greater than the difference between the times of Moses and Jesus and that of the Prophet of Islam. This vast difference demands the abrogation of the laws of Islam, so that other laws, more appropriate to a modern progressive society, can be ordained.

Reply: Religion does not aim only at the material and physical perfection of man. It looks at the human being as a whole, and seeks to make him perfect both physically and spiritually, so that he may attain both material and spiritual bliss. Its deal is the social man who is perfect

from the above-mentioned point of view, not a social man who might be perfect in technology and politics but bankrupt in other aspects of humanity. These people looked at societies based on materialism. Matter is always in change, climbing up the ladder of perfection, and the same is true of materialistic societies. These people thought that a society based on religion would also always be subject to change and abrogation. But they over-looked the fundamental difference between the two societies. They forgot that Islam does not aim at a lop-sided development of man; instead, it seeks well-balanced development, where man becomes perfect as a whole, both in body and soul. Before demanding the abrogation of Islam, they should produce an individual or a society which combines religious tenets and material progress. Then they should say what deficiency has been left therein which should be completed by a new shariah, or what weakness is there which needs a new law. Unless and until they produce such a society to point to the supposed defects, they have no justification in claiming that Islam should be abrogated.

Seventh: The prophets (peace be on them all) were sinless and protected from error and sin.

almizan.org

Sinlessness of the Prophets

ʿIṣmah which is generally translated as "sinlessness," literally means 'protection.' The 'protection' with which we are concerned here, is of three kinds:

(1) Protection from error in receiving the revelation,
(2) Protection from error in communicating and imparting that revelation to the people, and
(3) Protection from sins. Sin here means any thing or action which goes against the obligatory command of God, and thus becomes a disgrace for the man. In other words, any word or action which is against the dictates of the servitude, homage and devoutness of man towards his Lord.

almizan.org

ʿIṣmah in religious terminology, means the presence, in the man concerned, of a quality which protects him from committing any thing unlawful, any error or sin.

So far as *ʿiṣmah* from extraneous things (that is, other than receiving revelation and its communication, and sins) is concerned—for example, mistakes in perception by any of the five senses, or misjudging the benefit

or harm of a medicine, food or other such thing, and so on—it is not relevant to this verse which we are now discussing.

Anyhow, the Qur'an definitely proves that every prophet was *maʿṣūm* (sinless, protected from mistakes) in all the above mentioned three aspects.

ʿIṣmah from error in receiving the revelation and in its communication to the people: The following sentences, in the verse under discussion, prove these two aspects: *so Allah sent the prophets, as bearers of good tidings and as warners, and He sent down with them the book with the truth, so that it might judge between the people in that in which they had differed. And none differed about it but the very people who were given it, after clear signs had come to them, revolting among themselves; whereupon Allah guided, by His will, those who believed to the truth about which they differed.*

These words show that God sent them to bring the good tidings and to warn; and sent the book with them (and this was the "revelation"), so that they might guide the people to true belief and true deeds. This was the aim and object of God in appointing the prophets. And He says: *errs not my Lord, nor does He forget* (20:52). It proves that God errs not in His action, and makes no mistakes in His affairs; when He wills a thing, He wills it in its proper way which creates the desired effect without fail; when He proceeds with a work, the result is produced without any mistake. It is as it should be, because in His hand is creation and command, and for Him is power and judgement. And He sends prophets by revealing to them the true knowledge of religion and teaching it to them—and without fail it must be so; of necessity the prophets must receive and understand the revelation correctly; and He sends them to communicate that revelation to their people, and without fail it must be so; without any error or mistake they must communicate it as God has willed. God says: *Surely Allah attains His purpose; Allah indeed has made a measure for everything* (65:3); *and Allah is predominant over His affair* (12:21).

Another verse which proves these two types of *ʿiṣmah* is as follows: *The Knower of the Unseen; so He does not reveal His secrets to any except to him whom He chooses for an apostle; for surely He makes a guard to march before him and after him, so that He may know that they have indeed delivered the messages of their Lord, and He encompasses what is with them and He takes account of everything* (72:26-28). It is clear that God reserves His revelation for His messengers; so He reveals His secrets to them and supports them by guarding them from in front of them and behind them;

and encompasses what is with them to protect the revelation from decay and alteration, whether that alteration comes from Satan or others; and it is done to make sure that they have indeed correctly delivered the messages of their Lord. Another verse reports the words of the angels of revelation: *and we do not come down but by the command of your Lord; His is whatever is before us and whatever is behind us and whatever is between these; and your Lord is not forgetful* (19:64). These verses prove that the revelation right from the start of its descent, to its reaching down to the prophets and up to its communication and delivery to the people is duly protected and guarded against change and alteration, from whatever source it might come.

These two verses prove the *ʿiṣmah* of the prophets in receiving and delivering the revelation only; but they may also be used, with the addition of one rational premises, to prove their *ʿiṣmah* from sins. For an average man, actions speaks as loudly as, if not louder than, words. If someone does a certain thing, his action proves that in his eyes that work is good and lawful; it is as if he was announcing its legality and virtue in so many words. If a prophet committed a sin, while he forbade it to his people, it would mean that he was preaching two contradictory things: his action allowed a thing, while his words forbade it. Thus he would be preaching two things contradictory to each other. And preaching contradictory things is against the preaching of truth, because one order would belie and invalidate the other. One who reports two contradictory items cannot be said to be reporting the truth. Therefore, *ʿiṣmah* of the prophet in delivering the message of God totally depends upon his *ʿiṣmah* from the sins.

There are many other verses which prove *ʿiṣmah* of the prophets in all its aspects:

(a) *These are they whom Allah has guided; therefore, follow their guidance* (6:90). All the prophets were decidedly guided by God. And God says: *and whomsoever Allah lets go astray, there is no guide for him; and whom Allah guides, there is none that can lead him astray; is not Allah Mighty, the Lord of retribution?* (39:36-37) Also He says: *whomsoever Allah guides, he is the rightly guided one* (18:17). According to these verses those who are guided by God can never be led astray by any misleading agency. In other words, they are free from all misguidance; and every sin is a misguidance, as is shown by the words of God, *Did I not enjoin on you, O children of Adam! that you should not worship the Satan? Surely he is your open enemy,*

and that you should worship Me; this is the right way. And certainly he led astray a great multitude from among you. What! could not then understand? (36:60-62) In this verse, God counts every sin as going astray, a misguidance as a result of the agency of Satan; at the same time regarding it as the worship of Satan. Looking at all the above verses we find that:

God guided all the prophets by His guidance. Anyone guided by God's guidance can never be misled, can never go astray. Every sin is a misguidance; every sin is straying from the right path. It follows that the prophets of God were sinless, free from every sin and protected from every mistake in receiving and delivering the revelation of God.

(b) *And whoever obeys Allah and the Messenger these are with those upon whom Allah has bestowed the favors of the prophets and the truthful and the martyrs and the righteous ones; and excellent are these as companions*! (4:69) Also He says: *Keep us on the right path, the path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favors, not [the path] of those inflicted with Thy wrath, nor [of those] gone astray* (1:5-7).

The prophets are described as of those upon whom God has bestowed His favors; and those upon whom God's favors have been bestowed are other than those who have gone astray. It means that the prophets never went astray. If they had committed a sin, they would have gone astray (as explained above). Also, if they had committed any error or mistake in receiving or communicating the revelation, they would have gone astray. Therefore, the two verses together prove the *ʿiṣmah* of the prophets in all these aspects.

(c) *These are they on whom Allah bestowed favors, of the prophets of the posterity of Adam, and of those whom We carried with Noah, and of the posterity of Abraham and Israel, and of those whom We guided and chose. When the signs of the Beneficent [Allah] were recited to them, they fell down prostrating [in obedience] and weeping. But there followed after them an evil generation, who neglected prayer and followed sensual desires, so they shall soon meet [the result of their] sin* (19:58-59). This verse attributes two virtues to the prophets: first, the bestowing of favors (*upon whom Allah bestowed favors*); second, guidance (*whom We guided and chose*). Then it goes on praising them for the highest degree of obedience, devoutness and humility before God. Afterwards, it condemns the unworthy following generation for their evil traits. Obviously, we see here two opposite groups: one, the praiseworthy ones deserving to be honored by God; the

other, the condemned ones. This second group has been described as those who followed sensual desires and who will soon see the result of their sins. It clearly means that the first group, that is, the prophets, did not follow their desires and will not be overtaken by sin. Such sincere servants of God could not commit any sin, even before their appointment as prophets. Had they committed any sin even before their receiving prophethood, they would have surely come under the condemnation, neglected prayer and followed sensual desires, so they shall soon meet (the result of their) sin. But, as we explained, theirs is a group of diametrically opposite to the condemned ones.

This Qur'anic proof is somewhat similar to the rational proof given for the *ʿiṣmah* of the prophets, which is as follows:

The sending of the prophets and the showing of miracles in their hands is the confirmation of their words. It means that they cannot tell a lie. Also, it is an endorsement that they have the ability to communicate the message of God to their people. But a man who indulges in sins and such actions as would harm a project, cannot be said to be qualified to preach the usefulness of that project or to invite the people to participate in it. Therefore, when God showed miracles in the hands of the prophets it not only authenticated their claim of prophethood, but also confirmed that they could not commit error in receiving and delivering the divine revelation, and that they faithfully obeyed all the commands of God and desisted from all such things which were disliked by God. In other words, they were sinless in all its aspects.

Question: All intelligent people take help, in all varieties of social needs and communications, from those who may discharge their duties to a certain extent, even if their delivery of the message or their performance in that social work is not quite perfect. What is wrong if God sends prophets who are capable of doing His work to a certain extent, even if occasionally they indulged in sin?

Reply: Men overlook such defects in their agents for one of two reasons: either they do not mind a little short-coming and deficiency, or their aim is to get only that amount of service which the agent is qualified for.

But both these alternatives are unacceptable for a divine scheme. These alternatives show the deficiency and shortcoming of not only the agents but also of the principal. God cannot be like us mortals.

An Objection: God says, *why should not then a company from every*

party from among them go forth that they may acquire [proper] understanding in religion, and that they may warn their people when they come back to them, so that they may be cautious? (9:122)

Here God has entrusted Muslim scholars with the task of warning their people. And those scholars are not sinless.

Reply: Muslim scholars (admittedly not sinless) have been allowed by this verse to communicate to their people what they have learned about religion. It does not say that God confirms their words of warning, nor that their words are recognized by God as a divine proof over people. It is this divine confirmation and recognition which is the basic characteristic of prophethood, not mere warning.

(d) *And We did not send any messenger but that he should be obeyed by Allah's permission …* (4:64). The aim of sending a messenger is that he must be obeyed, and the verse confines the aim to only this one thing. People should obey the messenger in both his words and actions, because preaching is done in both ways. And both these aspects of obedience are covered by God's permission. If a messenger erred in understanding the revelation or in its delivery, it would still be God's will, according to this verse, that people should obey and follow him. But God only permits truth. How can His permission be related to an error or mistake? Thus, it is clear that a messenger cannot err in receiving or delivering a revelation. Likewise, if a messenger were to commit a sin, in words or actions, an impossible situation would arise. Sin is disliked by God, forbidden by Him. But the verse enjoins people to obey and follow their apostle. Thus that same sin would, at the same time, be for the people an act of obedience which they would be required to follow and copy. It would mean that God had, at one and the same time, willed it and not willed it, ordered it and forbade it; liked it and disliked it! As explained earlier, it would be an impossible order. We do not mean an order to do an impossible work (which, some do say, can be given by God!): we mean that giving such an order is in itself an impossibility, because it would be, at one and the same time, an order and a non-order, a will and non-will, a liking and non-liking, a praise and non-praise, a condemnation and non-condemnation!!

(e) *… so that there may not remain any argument for people against Allah, after the messengers …* (4:165). It is clear that God wills to intercept the excuse which people might think of for their sins and disobedience; and that the only way of dismissing such excuse is by sending the

messengers to them. The coming of the messengers could cut their excuse short only if the messengers themselves desisted from all those things which God does not like—be it in word or action. Otherwise, people could easily give their messengers' sins and mistakes as their excuse, and that argument would be valid against God. Therefore, if God had sent a fallible messenger, He would have defeated His own purpose.

Question: It is accepted that the verses prove that the prophets do not commit any mistake or sin. But this does not prove that they had *ʿiṣmah*. *ʿIṣmah*, as defined by scholars, does not mean merely 'not committing any sin'; it is "a faculty which protects a man from committing any sin or mistake." Doing or not doing a work does not prove that the man concerned possesses the faculty, or characteristic, of that doing or not doing. The verses prove that they did not commit any sin; while to prove *ʿiṣmah* it should be proved that they could not commit any.

Answer: What is needed for proving the subject matter of this verse, is only the fact that the prophets did not commit any sin or mistake. And the questioner accepts that the verses prove it.

To prove that this fact was based on a characteristic or faculty of the prophets, look up the subject of 'miracle' in the first volume. There it was shown that the verse, *Surely my Lord is on the straight path* (11:56), and *Surely Allah attains His purpose; Allah indeed has made a measure for every thing* (65:3) prove that every happening depends on a cause which brings it into being. Now in the case of a prophet, we see that all his actions throughout his life are invariably correct, proper and in obedience to God. This firm and unchanging characteristic shows that there must be a faculty in his soul which protects him from committing any sin or mistakes, and causes all his actions to be in accordance with the commands of God. And that faculty is *ʿiṣmah*.

It is accepted that all actions of a prophet occur by his own will, as do our own actions. But his actions are always in obedience to God, while our actions are sometimes in obedience and sometimes in disobedience. An action is said to occur by our will when it is based on our knowledge and discretion. Our actions differ in obedience and disobedience because of a difference in the knowledge and will from which they emanate. If our knowledge and will demand to fulfil the dictates of servitude by obeying the divine command, obedience comes into being. If, on the other hand, our knowledge and will prefer the pursuit of pleasure and the satisfaction

of lust, then disobedience and sin occur. In short, the difference in the quality of our actions, obedience or disobedience, is caused by the difference in our knowledge and will. Had our knowledge and will remained unchanged throughout our life, all our actions would have been of one type only—either a life long obedience to God, or, God forbid, an unbroken chain of sins. As the actions of a prophet are invariably, according to the dictates of piety and in obedience to God, it follows that the knowledge and will from which his actions emanate are healthy ones, invariably good and virtuous. In other words, it is ingrained in his mind and soul that he must always serve and obey God. It is this firmly-rooted knowledge which is called a faculty, characteristics or trait, like the faculty of chastity, of bravery, of justice, and so on. When we admit that a prophet always obeys God and never commits any sin, we accept that he possesses a spiritual quality or faculty which always keeps him on right path and protects him from sin and mistakes. And that faculty is *ʿiṣmah*.

Also, we have shown that a prophet does not commit any error or mistake in receiving or delivering the divine revelation. It means that he possesses a spiritual quality which protects him from such mistakes.

If we say that a prophet does not have this spiritual faculty or characteristic (while it is known that he does not commit any sin or mistake) then it would mean that this unchanging habit (that is, always following the divine command and desisting from mistake and sin) is not related to any spiritual or psychological trait of his own—in other words, it is caused directly by the will of God, and that the prophet has no choice, option or will of his own in his actions; in short his actions are not caused by his knowledge and will. But it is already admitted that the actions of the prophet are based on his knowledge and will just like those of other human beings.

ʿIṣmah (protection) comes from God; He creates in the prophet a cause from which all his actions emanate—the actions which are done by his own will and are always in obedience to God; and that cause is the firmly-rooted knowledge—in other words, the characteristic, trait or faculty.

About Prophethood

God uses two words for those who received His revelations so as to guide people to the right path. These words are *rasūl* (apostle, messenger) and *nabī* (prophet), which divide, or almost divide, them into two

groups, *Allah says: … and the prophets and the witnesses shall be brought up …* (39:69); *On the day when Allah will assemble the messengers, then say: What answer were you given?* (5:109) *Rasūl* means the one who brings the message (*risālah*); *nabī* is the one who brings the news (*naba'*). *Rasūl* has the distinction of being an intercessor (or intermediary) between God and His creatures. *Nabī* has the distinction of having the knowledge of God and from God.

It is said that *rasūl* is the one who is sent by God and commissioned to convey the divine message to the people; and *nabī* is the one who is sent by God, whether he is told to convey the message or not. According to this interpretation, the relationship between the messenger and prophet is such that all messengers are prophets but not all the prophets are messengers.

But the words of God do not support this view. For example, God says: *And remember Moses in the Book; surely he was one purified and was a messenger, a prophet* (19:51). The aim of this verse is to praise Moses and show his greatness and in such a context the adjectives should progress from general to distinctive and not vice versa.[1]

Also at another place, God says: *And We did not send before you any messenger or prophet but …* (22:52) This verse joins the messengers and the prophets together and then uses the verb "to send" (*irsāl*) for both, making all of them messengers (*mursal*).

But there are other verses which apparently show that everyone who was sent by God to people was a prophet. See, for example, *… and the book shall be laid down, and the prophets and the witnesses shall be brought up …* (39:69); *… but he is the Messenger of Allah and the Last of the prophets …* (33:40); and also the verse under discussion, *… so Allah sent the prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners …* All these verses show that the prophets were sent with a divine message to people. Then what is the significance of the verse (19:51) mentioned above, *… and was a messenger and a prophet*? Probably, the two words have been used here in their literal sense: Moses was a Messenger of God and had the knowledge and information of the signs of God and His secrets.

---

1 The author says later in this discourse that messengership is more particular than prophethood, in practice, but not in meaning. What he shows in verse 19:51 quoted is that the distinction is not in meaning. Therefore, it is clear that every messenger is a prophet but not vice versa. (Ed.)

Likewise, the next-mentioned verse (*And We did not send before you any messenger or prophet but …*) may be taken to mean that the prophet and the messenger both are sent to the people, but the prophet is sent to convey to them information of the unseen, as he knows the divine secrets, and the messenger is sent to bring them something more than a prophetic communication. This may be inferred from the verses, like: *And every people had a messenger; so when their messenger came, the matter was decided between them with justice …* (10:47) and *nor we chastise until We raise a messenger (*17:15). Accordingly, the prophet explains to people what is good for their lives in this world and in the hereafter, the roots of the religion and its branches, as the mercy of God decides to guide the people to their bliss and felicity; and the messenger brings to people a special message to complete the proof over them, a message, rejection of which brings destruction and chastisement in its wake. God says: … *that there may not remain any argument for people against Allah after the messengers* (4:165).

In short, the words of God do not show any difference between the two except what appears from their literal meaning. And it leads us to the same conclusion which we have mentioned earlier, that is, messenger has the distinction of being an intercessor (or intermediary) between God and His creatures, and the prophet has the distinction of having the knowledge of God and from God.

We shall later quote the traditions of the imams of Ahl al-Bayt about the difference between a messenger and a prophet.

The Qur'an very clearly says that there were numerous prophets, and that God has not described all of them in His Book. For example, God says: *And certainly We sent messengers before you: there are some of them that We have mentioned to you and there are others whom We have not mentioned to you …* (40:78)

There are twenty odd prophets mentioned by name in the Book of God: Adam, Noah, Idrīs, Hūd, Ṣāliḥ, Abraham, Lot, Ishmael, Alyasaʿ, Dhu al-Kifl, Ilyās, Jonah, Isaac, Jacob, Jethro, Moses, Aaron, David, Solomon, Zachariah, John, Ishmael (*Ṣādiq al-waʿd*), Jesus, and Muḥammad, may God bless them all.

Some other prophets have been mentioned, but not by name. God says: *Did you not look at the chiefs of the children of Israel after Moses, when they said to a prophet of theirs; Raise up for us a king …* (2:246); *Or like him*

who passed by a town, and it had fallen down … (2:259); *When We sent to them two, and they rejected both of them, so We strengthened [them] with a third ….*(36:14); *Then they found one from among Our servants whom We had granted mercy from Us and whom We had taught knowledge from Ourselves* (18:65); *the grandchildren* (2:136).

There are some about whom it is not clear whether they were prophets or not, like the servant (disciple) of Moses (*And when Moses said to his servant*—18:60), Dhu al-Qarnayn, Amram (father of Mary) and ʿUzayr (Ezra). (The first one is mentioned in the Qur'an by an adjective and the other by name)

The Qur'an has not mentioned how many prophets there were all together. The traditions giving their number are not *mutawātir* and differ among themselves. The most well-known is the tradition of Abū Dharr that the prophet told him that there were one hundred and twenty-four thousand prophets; three hundred and thirteen of them were messengers.

The chiefs of all the prophets are the ones endowed with fortitude (*ulu al-ʿazm*); and they are Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad (blessings of God be on him and them all!) God says: *Therefore bear up patiently as did the messengers endowed with fortitude bear up with patience…* (46:35) It will be explained later on that *ʿazm* (fortitude, determination, firm resolve) in this context means that they firmly upheld the first covenant they made with God, and they never forgot it. God says: *And when We made a covenant with the prophets and with you, and with Noah and Abraham and Moses and Jesus, son of Mary, and We took from them a firm covenant* (33:7). Also He says: *And certainly We had covenanted unto Adam before, but he forgot and We did not find in him any determination (*20:115).[1]

Each of these five messengers brought a new law and a book. God says: *He has prescribed for you of the religion what He enjoined upon Noah and that which We have revealed unto you, and that which We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus …* (42:13); *Most surely this is in the earlier scriptures, the scriptures of Abraham and Moses* (87:18-19); *Surely We sent down the Torah in which was guidance and light; with it the prophets …*

1 As per the author's explanation of verse 2:35 (Eng. vol. 1), the covenant mentioned in this verse (20:115) means the general covenant which was made with the whole mankind and more particularly with the prophets. (Ed.)

were judging [matters] … And We sent after them in their footsteps Jesus, son of Maryam, verifying what was before him of the Torah … And We have revealed to you the Book with the truth, verifying what is before it of the Book and a guardian over it; therefore, judge between them by what Allah has revealed and do not follow their desires [to turn away] from the truth that has come to you; for every one of you did We appoint a law and a way, and if Allah had pleased He would have made you [all] a single people, but that He might try you in what He gave you … (5:44-48)

These verses clearly show that these five *ulu al-ʿazm* prophets had been given laws, and that Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad (peace be on them all) were given books. So far as the book of Noah is concerned, we have already explained that the verse under discussion, read together with verse 42:13, proves that he was given a book. All these books contained a law and a shariah.

The Qur'an says that David was given a book (*And We gave David the Zabūr* (4:163)), and according to the traditions, Adam, Shīth and Idrīs also were given books. But we are not concerned here with those books, because they did not contain any law or shariah.

Revelation is essential for prophethood. Revelation is a sort of talk of God, and prophethood depends upon it. God says: *Surely We have revealed to you as We revealed to Noah and the prophets after him …* (4:163). A full discussion of revelation will be given, God willing, in the Chapter of al-Shūra (Ch. 42).

Examining Narrations

(1) Imam al-Bāqir said: "The people before Noah, were one people, on the creation of God, neither rightly guided nor gone astray, then God raised the prophets." (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

(2) There is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq that he said about this verse (2:213): And it was before Noah. He was asked whether they were on the right path. He said: "Rather they were astray. When Adam and his good children died, his successor, Shīth, was unable to expound the religion of God which was followed by Adam and his good children. It was so because Qābīl had threatened to kill him as he had killed his brother, Hābīl. Therefore, Shīth lived among them in fear, keeping his religion secret. Their straying increased day by day until nobody remained with them on the

earth except those who had already passed away. And the successor (of Adam) settled in an island to worship God. Then God decided to raise the messengers. And if these ignorant ones were asked they would say that He (God) had finished the matter; but they are liars; verily it is thing about which God decrees every year." Then the Imam recited: *Therein every wise affair is made distinct* (44:4). (Then he said:) "So God decrees what should happen during the year, hardship or abundance or rain or other such things." The narrator asked whether they had gone astray before the prophet or were on the right path. The Imam said: "They were not on guidance. They were on the creation of God upon which they were created. There is no change in the creation of God. And they were not to be guided until God guided them. Do you not hear the words of Abraham, *Had not my Lord guided me, I would certainly have been of the erring people (*6:77) that is, forgetful of the covenant." (al ʿAyyāshī)

Author's comment: The words, "They were not on guidance. They were on creation of God," explain the words they were astray which have been used in the beginning of the tradition. It means that they were not guided in detail to the divine knowledge, but had its rudimentary knowledge. And such a guidance may be termed straying in the meaning of ignorance of details. The first tradition, quoted from *Majmaʿ al-bayān*, mentions it in these words: "on the creation of God, neither rightly guided nor gone astray."

The last words of this tradition, "forgetful of the covenant" also explain the straying mentioned earlier. Guidance is the remembrance of the covenant in its reality (as is the case with the perfect believers), or the carrying on like those who remember the covenant, even if one oneself does not remember it in reality (as is the case of most of the believers); and giving the name of guidance to this second group is only because of the mercy of God.

(3) Hishām b. al-Ḥakam narrates that an atheist came to Abū ʿAbdillāh, and asked him, "From where did you prove the prophets and messengers?" The Imam said: "When we proved that there is a Creator and a Maker who is elevated above us and above all the created things, and that Creator is wise, and that it is not possible for His creatures to see Him or touch Him; and

that He cannot live with them nor they with Him, and He cannot have discussion with them nor they argue with Him; then it is proved that He must have in His creation some envoys to guide the people to their advantage and interest and to that on which depends their existence and the neglect of which brings their destruction. Thus it is proved that there should be some people to enjoin (good) and forbid (evil) on behalf of the (Creator who is) wise and Cognizant of His creation. It all proves that He has his interpreters, and they are the prophets, His chosen ones from among His creation, wise, well-trained in erudition, sent (to the people) with that (wisdom); not like the people in their conditions though they are like them in physique and the make-up of the body; supported by the Wise, the All-knowing with wisdom and proofs and arguments and evidence, like raising up the dead and healing the blind and the leper. So, the earth of God cannot remain empty from a proof (of God) with whom should be a sign to show that he is truthful in his words, and it is essential for him to be on justice." (*al-Tawḥīd*)

Author's comment: Evidently, this tradition contains three proofs about three subjects of prophethood:

First: A reason to prove the necessity of prophethood in general. On deep consideration you will find it in conformity with what we have inferred from the verse under discussion.

Second: The proof that it is necessary that the prophet be supported with miracles. It conforms with what we said about miracles under the verse (2:23), *And if you are in doubt as to that which We have revealed to Our servant, then produce a chapter like it …*

Third: The proof that there should always be a representative of God on this earth, be he a prophet or an imam. And we shall explain this, God willing, in a suitable place.

(4) There is a tradition narrated by ʿUtbah al-Laythī from Abū Dharr (May God have mercy on him) that he said: "I said: 'O Messenger of God! How many prophets were there?' The Prophet said: 'One hundred and twenty-four thousand.' I said: 'How many of them were messengers?' He said: 'Three hundred and thirteen, a large crowd!' I said: 'Who was first of the prophets?' He said: Adam.' I said: 'Was he a messenger from among the prophets?' He said:

'Yes. God made him by His hand (power) and breathed into him of His spirit.' Then the Prophet said: 'O Abū Dharr! Four of the prophets were Syrians: Adam, Shīth, Ukhnūkh that is, Idrīs (and he was the first to write with the pen) and Noah; and four of them were Arabs: Hūd, Sāliḥ, Shuʿayb and your prophet, Muḥammad; and the first prophet among the children of Israel was Moses, and the last of them was Jesus and (between them were) six hundred prophets.' I said: 'O Messenger of God! How many books were sent down by God?' He said: 'One hundred and four books. God sent down fifty books unto Shīth, and thirty books unto Idrīs, and twenty books unto Abraham, and He sent down the Torah, and the Gospel, and that Zabūr, and al-Furqān.' " (*al-Khiṣāl* and *Maʿānī al-akhbār*)

Author's comment: This tradition, and especially its first part describing the number of the prophets and the messengers, is famous, and it has been narrated by Shias and Sunnis in their books. And al-Ṣadūq has narrated a tradition of the same meaning in *al-Khiṣāl* and *al-Amālī*, from Imam al-Ridā through his forefathers from the Prophet; and (another tradition) from Zayd b. ʿAlī through his father and grandfather from ʿAlī; and similar traditions have been reported by Ibn Qawlawayh in *Kāmil al-ziyārah* and by al-Sayyid in *al-Iqbāl* from al-Sajjād and in *al-Balāʾir* from Imam al-Bāqir.

(5) There is a tradition from Imam al-Bāqir about the words of God: *and he was a messenger, a prophet* (19:51), that he said: "The prophet is the one who sees in his dream and hears the voice but does not see the angel; and the messenger is the one who hears the voice, and does not see in dreams, and sees the angel."(*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: There are other traditions with this meaning. Possibly, their meaning may be inferred from such verses as, *therefore, send Thou to Aaron* (26:13) This tradition does not say that the messenger means the one to whom the angel of revelation is sent. It simply says that prophethood and messengership are two ranks, the speciality of the one is seeing in the dream, and of the other is seeing the angel of revelation. Sometimes, both ranks are combined in one person, then the two specialities are found together; and sometimes prophethood is found without messengership. Therefore, messengership is more particular than prophethood, in practice, but not in meaning. See for example, the tradition of

Abū Dharr, mentioned above, in which he asks, "how many of the prophets were messengers?"

Therefore, it is clear that every messenger is a prophet but not vice versa. This clear explanation provides the answer to the misunderstanding of some people who say that the Holy Prophet of Islam was not the last messenger, though he was the last prophet. Their "argument" is as follows:

God says: *but he* (that is, Muḥammad) *is the Messenger of Allah and the last of the prophets* (33:40). The verse says that he was the last of the prophets, but does not say that he was the last of the messengers."

Reply: Prophethood is, in fact, more general and comprehensive than messengership. When a general item is negated its particular groups are automatically negated.

And so far as the traditions are concerned they have never said that messengership can be found without prophethood. As you have seen they clearly say that all messengers were prophets, but not all prophets were messengers.

(6) Imam al-Riḍā said: The *ulu al-ʿazm* prophets were given this name because they were people of firm determination and (brought a new) law. It was like this: Every prophet coming after Noah was on his shariah and his way, and followed his (Noah's) book up to the time of Abraham, the friend (of God). And every prophet from the time of Abraham was on the shariah of Abraham and his way and followed his book up to the time of Moses. And every prophet from the time of Moses was on the shariah of Moses and his way and followed his book up to the time of Jesus. And every prophet who was in the time of Jesus and after him, was on the shariah of Jesus and his way and followed his book up to the time of our prophet, Muḥammad. So, these five are *ulu al-ʿazm*, and they are the best of the prophets and messengers (peace be on them all). And the shariah of Muḥammad will not be abrogated till the Day of Resurrection. Therefore, anyone who makes a claim to prophethood after him or to bringing a book after the Qur'an, his blood is allowed (that is, it is allowed to kill him) to anyone who hears this (claim) from him." (*ʿUyūn al–akhbār*)

Author's comment: A tradition of similar meaning is reported from (Imam) al-Ṣadiq in *Qiṣal al-anbiyāʾ*.

(7) About the verse: *Therefore, bear up patiently as did the messengers*

endowed with fortitude bear up with patience, that the messengers referred to here are Noah, Abraham, Moses and Jesus (peace be on them all). And the meaning of "endowed with fortitude" is that they were the first of all prophets in believing in God, and they believed in every prophet who was before them or came after them; and they were determined to remain patient even when they were rejected (by their people) and tormented. (*al-Tafsīr*, al-Qummī)

Author's comment: It has been narrated by Sunni chains from Ibn ᶜAbbās and Qatādah that the prophets endowed with patience were five: Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad. It is the same as narrated in the traditions of Ahl al-Bayt. There are other views attributed to some Sunni scholars. One said that they were six: Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Job. Another said that they were the prophets who were given the order to fight in the way of God, and thus waged war. Some one said that they were four: Abraham, Noah, Hūd, and the fourth was Muḥammad. But all these sayings are without any proof.

(8) There is a tradition narrated by al-Thumālī from Imam al-Bāqir, that he said: "The prophets between Ādam and Noah were concealed, and that is why they were not mentioned in the Qur'an nor were they named therein as were named those prophets who declared themselves (before their people)." (al-ᶜAyyāshī)

Author's comment: This meaning has been narrated from the imams of Ahl al-Bayt by numerous chains.

(9) *Tafsīr* of al-Ṣāfī quotes from *Majmaᶜ al-bayān* a tradition of (Imam) ᶜAlī that God raised a black prophet whose story He did not reveal to us.

(10) In the first sermon of *Nahj al-balāghah*, (Imam) ᶜAlī says, mentioning Adam:

"Then (God) sent him down to the place of trial and procreation of progeny. And from his progeny God chose prophets and took their pledge for (His) revelation and for carrying (His) message as their trust. In the course of time, many people changed the covenant which God had made with them; thus they ignored His right, and took partners along with Him. And Satan turned them away from knowing Him and cut them off from His worship. Then God raised among them His messengers, and sent to them

His prophets one after another, to exhort the people to fulfil the covenant of His creation; and to remind them of His bounties which were forgotten; and to argue with them by communicating (to them revelation), and to bring out for them the buried (treasures of) wisdom, and to show the signs of His omnipotence: namely, the roof (that is, sky) which is raised over them, and the floor (that is, earth) which is placed beneath them, and the means of livelihood that sustain them, and the deaths that make them die, and the ailments that turn them old, and the happenings that successively betake them. And God never allowed His creation to remain without a prophet sent (by Him), or a book sent down (from Him), or a binding proof, or a laid-down highway—the messengers who were not discouraged by the smallness of their (followers') number or largeness of their rejectors. Among them was a predecessor who was told the name of his follower, or a follower introduced by his predecessor. In this way, ages passed by, and the times rolled on, and the fathers passed away while the sons took their place, till God raised Muḥammad in fulfilment of His promise and to finalize His prophethood."

Author's comment: "In fulfilment of His promise" refers to the promise made by God to sending His messenger, Muḥammad; and good tiding of him were brought by Jesus and other prophets (peace be on them), as God says: *And the word of your Lord has been accomplished truly and justly …* (6:115)

(11) There is a tradition narrated by ʿAbdullāh b. al-Walīd from Imam al-Ṣādiq that he said: "God said about Moses: *And We wrote for him in the tablets admonition from everything …* (7:145) So, we know that He did not write for Musa everything (but only a portion 'from everything'). And He said quoting Jesus: *so that I may make clear to you part of what you differ in …* (43:63). And He said to Muḥammad: *… and [will] bring you as a witness against these; and We revealed the Book to you explaining clearly everything …* (16:89)" (al-ʿAyyāshī)

Author's comment: The same meaning has been narrated in *Balāʾir al-darajāt* from ʿAbdullāh b. al-Walīd by two chains.

The words of the Imam, "God said about Moses…" point out that the words of God, in the tablets … from every thing explain the immediately

following words about the Torah, and clear explanation of all things. If God had meant a comprehensive description of every thing, He would not have said, from everything which refers only to a portion, not to the whole. This "from" shows that the "explanation of everything" means only a partial, not a comprehensive, explanation of everything.

almizan.org

Prophethood From a Philosophical Point of View

Prophethood, as such, is primarily a theological, not a philosophical, subject. It is concerned with ordained laws which have no independent physical existence; while philosophy is concerned with those things which exist outside the imagination, which have existence independent of the mind of the beholder.

Even then, looking from a different angle, we may say that it is also a philosophical subject.

Religious teachings—its fundamental beliefs and moral and practical laws—have a strong relation with the human soul; they etch on the mind firm knowledge and qualities which, in their turn, create firmly ingrained characteristics and abilities. This knowledge and these characteristics give a distinct identity to the human soul and decide its path, either towards bliss and nearness to God, or towards perdition and distance from Him. Man, if he has true and correct beliefs and acts righteously, acquires those perfections which bring him nearer to God and His pleasure and take him to paradise. On the other hand, if he has wrong beliefs and does evil acts, his soul will acquire an ugly face; he will have no other goal except this transitory world and its trinkets, and, as a result, after departing from this world, he will enter hell and perdition.

almizan.org

This journey of human soul—to paradise or to hell—is not a thing confined into mind; it is a fact and a reality existing independent of human imagination. Accordingly it becomes a philosophical subject; and we may philosophically prove the institution of prophethood as follows:

The earlier mentioned abilities and characteristics of the human soul take him on the road to perfection. Man is a species existing in reality, and he is the cause of many effects which also exist in reality. Experience shows that all existing things have been given the ability to reach their perfection. And God is the absolute Benefactor and there is no limit for His beneficence, so far as He is concerned. Therefore, every soul must have been given what it needs to reach its perfection, and to turn its abilities

into accomplishments—the accomplishments which are called bliss if they contain good attributes and virtuous characteristics, and perdition if they take the shape of bad habits and evil characteristics.

These characteristics are acquired by those of man's actions which are done of his own will and choice. That choice is based on his belief that a certain thing is good and another bad. He has been given the instincts of love and fear. He loves what he thinks beneficial for him and fears what, in his thinking, is harmful. Love and fear are the only two instincts from which the actions of common man emanate. Therefore, the beneficence of God also should make use of these two faculties of man. God should call man to follow the right path and live a virtuous life; and that call should be accompanied by love and fear, good tidings and warnings. In this way, true believers will reach their perfection of bliss and felicity; and unbelievers and the unjust will reach the perfection of misery and unhappiness.

And the call needs a caller to communicate the divine message to human beings. And that caller is the prophet sent by God.

Question: The faculty of reason and wisdom is enough to exhort man to follow the truth in belief and action and to lead him to excellence and piety. So, what is the need of sending the prophets?

Answer: It has been explained earlier that there is a pure and spiritual wisdom which perceives the real nature of things. Also, there is practical wisdom which says, 'this is good' and 'that is bad.' It is this practical wisdom which invites man to follow the truth in belief and action. This wisdom bases its judgement on human feelings and emotions; and in the beginning, the only emotions that exist in man are desire and fear. The faculty of pure spiritual wisdom and intellect, which can control these emotions, remains only a potentiality.

It has been explained at length that it is this desire and fear, this emotion and feeling which lead man to conflict and difference. If man were left under the control of these emotions, his intellect and other potentialities would never turn into accomplishments. It does not take long for an individual or a nation, when they have been deprived of good training, to return to barbarism and savagery, even though they have the practical wisdom and are governed by natural instincts.

Therefore, there is always need of divine help in the form of prophethood to strengthen the intellect and pure spiritual wisdom.

Sociological Arguments About Prophethood

Question: It may be accepted that human wisdom cannot act independently in all situations concerning an individual or a nation. But nature always progresses towards its good, and also society, which is based on nature, follows it and moves towards the good of its individual members, and finally acquires an ideal form which ensures the happiness of all its members. This principle is called the effect of the environment. Conflicting faculties and powers, after action and reaction, ultimately create a noble society, befitting human life. History and experience show that all societies are always in search of their perfection; they aspire for the common weal and are progressing towards a felicity and happiness which are the final ambition of every man. Some societies, like Switzerland, have already attained that goal, while others are on the way, and may be nearer to, or farther from, it.

Answer: Nobody can deny that nature always strives to attain perfection and happiness; and that society, which is based on nature, is also like that. But it should be remembered that its desired perfection and bliss is not real perfection and bliss. What nature possesses at the moment are the instincts of love and fear, not intellect. But it is the intellect which is the foundation of real perfection and bliss. Even the evidence offered in the question shows this fact. The perfection and happiness found in some countries and desired by others is only material perfection and the happiness of the body. But man is not a body only; he is made of both body and soul. The body's perfection is not man's perfection. The body dies while the spirit lives forever. Perfecting only one side and neglecting the other (and that also the one which is to last forever) is not perfection at all.

Historical and sociological evidence strengthens our view that society, by trial and error, can only progress towards material perfection and physical happiness if any society wants to lead its members to the perfection of the total being, then it cannot do so without prophetic help and divine guidance.

Question: If it is true that the prophetic call has a connection with divine creative guidance which leads everything to its goal of perfection, then it must have a clear and existing influence on human societies. We see that not only man but everything is naturally guided to the matters of its advantage and benefit without fail. If the prophetic call had been a guidance like that, it would have been influential in all human societies and

man would not have been able to ignore it, just as he is unable to ignore other natural calls. But we know that it is not so. So how can it be called a true reformation when it is not accepted by societies? So, the theory that the prophetic mission is necessary to remove the differences in society and life is just a theory which cannot be proved by facts.

Answer: First: (a) The effects, of the religious call are there for every one to see and appreciate. Only an obstinate contender can deny it. Since its foundation and appearance, it has trained thousands and thousands leading them to bliss, and has condemned several times more to perdition and unhappiness—depending on their acceptance or rejection, submission or arrogance and belief or disbelief. Such an effective thing cannot be said to have had no effect. (b) Some societies have from time to time been established based on religion, and they have shown what may be achieved by following this path. (c) This world is still alive; the human species is not yet extinct. It is possible that one of these days human society will turn into a virtuous society founded on religion—a society which will guarantee the true happiness of man, and real excellence of character and morality. It will be a day when none shall be worshipped except God, and justice and virtue shall be the norm of the day. Such a magnificent effect cannot be ignored or belittled.

Second: Sociology, psychology and moral science prove that our actions have a dual relationship with our characteristics: they come into being because of psychological factors, and they in their turn have an influence on psychological factors. The actions are the effects of soul and psyche; and they effect the psyche in its characteristics. It is this principle which has given birth to two principles the principle that man is influenced in his character and morals by society; and the principle that he inherits many characteristics from his forefathers. In short, these actions increase their scope horizontally through the environment, and continue from generation to generation vertically through heredity.

Now, it is known that the divinely appointed prophetic mission has remained with human societies since the dawn of humanity, not only in historical, but even in pre-historical, days. Nobody can deny that such a mission, such a call, must have deeply effected the man's social characteristics and high morals. This religious call must have influenced man's psyche very deeply, even if he does not believe in that call.

We would be justified in asserting that all the good qualities of

present-day nations and societies are the effects of prophethood and religion, which they have acquired through heredity or the environment. Religion, since its inception, has been accepted and followed by many great societies and groups. And do not forget that religion is the only institution which calls man to the true faith, to noble character, justice and common welfare. Whatever good traits are found today in nations (however little they may be) are the residue of the effects of religion and its results.

Societies can be managed in any of three ways - there is no fourth alternative. First is the system of tyranny. It turns human beings into the slaves of the tyrant (or tyrants) in all aspects of their lives. Second is the system based on civil laws. These laws control overt actions only; they do not touch other aspects of the human personality, like character and ethics. Third is religion which controls and rules over the whole being—beliefs, ethics, and actions—and calls to keep all of them on right path, with truth and virtue.

It is clear from the above that if there is any good in this world or any happiness and bliss for man, it must be attributed to religion and its effects, because no other system aspires to give any guidance on these matters.

Look, for further proof, at the nations that have built their societies on materialism and have neglected religion and morality. They soon lost the virtue, love, mercy and purity of heart and forgot all probity and ethical excellence. It all happened while they were following the dictates of nature. Had nature, per se, been enough, and had those characteristics not been a legacy of religion inherited from the ancients, they would not have lost those noble virtues.

History says that the Christians, during and after the Wars of the Crusades, adopted important points of Islamic law and acted upon them. Now they have advanced, while the Muslims, who did not follow their own religion, have been left behind.

To make a long story short, heredity and environment have let the spirit of religion permeate human society, as they do with other things. Therefore, it is wrong to say that religion has had no impact on humanity.

Question: Well then, what is the role of nature in this scheme? It appears from the above that nature is of no use, and that happiness and bliss are in the hands of the prophethood. If that is so, then why should the prophethood claim that the shariah is based on nature?

Answer: One has only to refer to what we have written on the

relationship of the nature to man's felicity and bliss to realize that this objection is baseless. The happiness and perfection brought by prophethood is not something alien to the human species nor is it separate from man's nature. It is nature which finds its way towards that bliss, but it cannot find it alone without outside help; and that help (that is, prophethood) also is not something separate from humanity and its perfection. In other words, prophethood is not like a stone put beside a man; otherwise, it would not have meant any credit to the prophet—that stone does not increase the weight of the man. The fact is that prophethood is the perfection of human nature; it is a special perception and a particular conception which is hidden in human nature; but only those few individuals can be led to find it whom the Grace of God has specially chosen for it. An analogy may be given—though it is beneath the dignity of prophethood—to the pleasure of the sexual act which only mature persons can feel; minors cannot know it, even when that instinct which both adults and minors equally share is ingrained in human nature.

In short, neither is the reality of prophethood something extraneous from the humanity of the man, who is the prophet, nor is the bliss which it brings to people who follow it anything separate from their humanity and nature. Otherwise, it could not be a perfection for the prophet or a bliss for his people.

Question: In that case, the objection is turned against prophethood. What the above explanation says is that nature by itself is enough, and prophethood is not separate from nature. It appears that the human species is social by nature and has diversity in its unity; that some individuals excel others in all good aspects: their nature is true, their intelligence free from imaginary things and lust, their character purified from undesirable traits. Those highly distinguished persons are guided by their straightforward character and discriminating wisdom to what contains the good of society and the happiness of man. Then they legislate laws which ensure the common weal and prosperity of this world and the hereafter.

Accordingly, the prophet is a virtuous man who is a social genius.

Answer: Not at all. It is an interpretation which does not fit with the reality of prophethood nor with its accompanying factors:

First: It is a hypothesis invented by some sociologists who had no knowledge of religious matters and knew nothing about the Creator or the final destination of man. It was their theory that a prophet is a genius

who has a straight forward character and healthy, wisdom. Such a genius ponders over the social condition of his time and thinks how his chaotic society may be reformed and how the members of society may find happiness and bliss.

According to this theory, that genius is 'the prophet'; the good healthy thought which flows from the fountain-head of his thinking power is 'the revelation'; the laws made by him for the reform of the society are 'the religion'; his pure spirit which showers these thoughts on his thinking power, and does not deceive the human world by following lustful desires is 'the Trustworthy Spirit' that is, Gabriel; the real inspirer of that revelation is 'God'; the book containing his lofty and pure thoughts is 'the heavenly book'; the natural powers or factors which call towards good are 'the angels'; the soul which incites to evil or the powers and factors inviting to bad deeds are 'Satan'; and so on.

It is a totally invalid theory, and I have mentioned under the subject of 'miracles' that prophethood with this meaning would be better called a political toy rather than divine prophethood. Also it has already been explained that this thinking, which they have named genius, is a particular phase of practical wisdom, which distinguishes between good and bad according to its benefit or harm, and is commonly found in all human beings. Also, it has been described that it is that wisdom which is the cause of all the conflicts and differences among human beings; and as such it cannot remove that difference itself. Surely, it needs another power to complete its work. And we have said just above that power is a special type of perception which is found, by the Grace of God, only in a few chosen persons who are called prophets.

Obviously, this special spiritual perception is totally different, in its reality, from the perception which comes through thinking. The results to which man reaches through thinking, logic and reasoning are completely unlike those which he perceives through the prophetic faculty. Not only the results, even the ways to obtain those results, are diametrically opposed to each other.

Psychologists are sure that man has an inner source of perception which occasionally manifests itself in some individuals. Then a door is opened before the eyes of this individual and he sees a world beyond this world and is given knowledge of astonishing facts and realities beyond the purview of reason and thinking. This fact is vouched for by all ancient

psychologists as well as a group of modern European scholars.

In short the way of prophetic revelation is different from reasoning and thinking. And prophethood cannot be given the meaning invented by these people. The same is the case with the shariah, religion, the heavenly Book, the angels, and Satan.

Second: What is recorded of the speech of the prophets who claimed they had received prophethood and revelation, like Muḥammad, Jesus, Moses, Abraham, Noah and others (peace be on them all), and what is extant from their books (like the Qur'an) clearly refutes the interpretations which these people have invented for prophethood, revelation, the sending of books, angels and the other realities of religion. The book of God, the traditions of the Holy Prophet of Islam and the sayings of the earlier prophets (peace be on them all) clearly say that these realities and their effects are beyond the sphere of matter and nature, and they are not a part of natural phenomena and cannot be perceived by any of the human senses.

With this background, the interpretation which tries to bring these prophetic realities within the jurisdiction of the physical world and under natural laws is a futile attempt which does not conform to the context and nature of the above meanings and sayings.

It has been mentioned earlier that the factor which removes conflict in the human society is this inner spiritual perception which is independent of that perception which comes through the agency of thinking.

Question: It would mean that this inner perception is something extraordinary and abnormal. It is not a common experience; only a few persons have ever claimed to have had it. How can such a rare experience lead the whole of society to reform and to the removal of conflict and difference? How can it guide them to their true happiness? You have already said that the factor which will lead the people to bliss and happiness must be related to and connected with, their nature; it should not be some thing extraneous like a stone at the side of a man.

Answer: There is no doubt whatsoever that prophethood is an extraordinary thing; and that it is an inner spiritual perception unknown to the five senses. But reason does not deny that extraordinary and abnormal things and things hidden from our senses do exist in the world. What it denies is the existence of something which is impossible. Reason has its ways to verify whether a thing claimed to be abnormal and hidden

from the senses really exists. It can prove its existence through its causes (deduction) or through its effects or its accompanying factors (induction).

Prophethood may be proved by one of two methods. (1) Through its effects—the religion brought by the prophet ensures the happiness of man in this world and in the hereafter. (2) Through its accompanying factors—the claimant of prophethood claims an abnormal thing, that God talks with him through revelation; therefore, if his claim is true he should be able to produce some other abnormal signs, which are called miracles.

Therefore we have these two ways to verify a claim of prophethood, the good quality of the religion brought by the prophet, and miracles.

Question: It may be agreed that the conflicts of society can be removed by this inner perception which is called prophetic revelation. It may also be agreed that the prophet can prove it through miracles, and then it will be obligatory on people to accept and follow the religion promulgated by him. But what is the guarantee that the prophet cannot commit any mistake in the promulgation of the shariah? After all, he is a human being like everyone else, and every one by nature commits mistakes. If an error occurred at this stage of promulgating the law and removing differences, the same process would have to be started again.

Answer: Previous explanations are enough to answer this question. The divine revelation does not come through human thinking, which might commit mistakes. It exists independently of human thought and imagination.

There is a law of creation, decreed by the Creator, that He, after creating a thing, guides it to its perfection. See the verse: *Our Lord is He Who gave to everything its creation, then guided it [to its goal]* (20:50). The thing created does exist in reality; it is a fact. There is no mistake or falsehood in a fact. Mistake and falsehood may occur when the man starts the process of his thinking and tries to acquire knowledge. Then what conforms with the fact is called truth and what does not conform is falsehood. Thus it is human thought which may be contaminated by lies and falsehood, and not the divine creation, which is a fact, a reality.

Now, the Creator made man and He guides him to his bliss and happiness, to his perfection, through a guidance which is called revelation. That revelation is a thing created by Him; it is a fact and a reality. And no falsehood can be attributed to a fact and a reality. A fact is a fact; a reality is a reality. As this guiding agency is a fact and creation of God, not

a result of human thinking, there can never be any mistake or error or falsehood in it. Nor can there be any such possibility in perceiving or communicating that revelation, because this also is done through the creative guidance of God. Neither does the creative power make any mistake in putting that prophetic spirit and spiritual perception (that is, revelation) in the person of the prophet nor does that agency of divine guidance, that is, the spiritual conception, make any mistake in discriminating between what is good for the humanity and what is bad for it.

That is why God does not bestow prophethood on anyone without creating in him the faculty of *ʿiṣmah*, the *ʿiṣmah* from mistake in receiving and communicating the revelation and *ʿiṣmah* in all matters connected with religion and promulgation of the shariah. This *ʿiṣmah* is other than *ʿiṣmah* from sin.

Question: Why is this inner perception not subject to change, deterioration and feebleness like human reason and thinking. Human thinking power is something other than matter. But, because it has a connection with matter (as it passes through the brain) it is subject to all types of changes. It can be strong or feeble; it may exist or cease to exist completely, as in the case of lunacy; also there are variations in its degree, as in the cases of idiots, the feeble-minded or the mentally-retarded, or in senile people.

Now, this inner perception also has a connection with the body of the prophet, and, as such it may also be subject to changes, deterioration and other defects. In that case all the previously mentioned difficulties would arise afresh.

Answer: We have already said that this guidance of human beings to their true happiness is done, not by human thinking, but by the hands of the Creator who brings that agency of guidance into being; that agency is a truly existing thing, and there is no question of any mistake in an existing thing or 'fact.'

It is not accepted that every perception, having any relation with body, is liable to change and deterioration. What is accepted is that perception based on reason and logic is liable to such change and deterioration; but it is known that this inner perception, that is, prophetic revelation does not come under this heading. For example, man has a perception of his own person, and this knowledge cannot change, disappear or deteriorate, because it is a self-evident knowledge, not based on reasoning or logic.

Now, we may sum up this long discussion as follows:

First: Mankind proceeds towards a social life and its differences.

Second: These differences, which cut at the root of the happiness of the species, is not, and cannot be, removed by the laws made by human wisdom which acts through reason and logic and are liable to mistake.

Third: The differences can only be removed by prophetic perception, which is created by God in some chosen human beings.

Fourth: The basis of this inner perception, found in the prophets, is totally different from the basis of human thinking, common to all sane men and women.

Fifth: This inner perception never makes any mistake in perceiving the beliefs and laws which are communicated to it by God for the betterment of the human species in its true happiness.

Sixth: These conclusions (and the last mentioned three are the most important: the essentiality of sending the prophets, the basic difference between the perception of revelation and perception based on reasons, and the *ʿiṣmah* (infallibility) of the prophet in receiving and communicating the revelation) are in conformity with the general scheme of things in this physical world. Every species in this world is progressing towards its perfection guided by the Creator who gave it the means to progress along the road to final perfection and bliss. Man is one of those species; and he has also been given the faculties by which he can acquire right beliefs and noble virtues and can do good acts in a good and noble society. Therefore, it is necessary that the Creator should make arrangement to bring that potential bliss into real existence; that He should guide him with His creative guidance which is free from mistake or error.

almizan.org

Verse 214

almizan.org

أَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ أَنْ تَدْخُلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَلَمَّا يَأْتِكُمْ مَثَلُ الَّذِينَ خَلَوْا مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ ۖ مَسَّتْهُمُ
الْبَأْسَاءُ وَالضَّرَّاءُ وَزُلْزِلُوا حَتَّىٰ يَقُولَ الرَّسُولُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مَعَهُ مَتَىٰ نَصْرُ اللَّهِ ۗ أَلَا
إِنَّ نَصْرَ اللَّهِ قَرِيبٌ ﴿٢١٤﴾

(2:214) ***Or do you think that you would enter the Garden while yet the like of those who have passed away before you has not come upon you; distress and affliction befell them and they were shaken violently, so that the apostle and those who believed with him said: When will the help of Allah come? Now, surely the help of Allah is nigh!***

Commentary

almizan.org

It has already been mentioned that these verses (from 208 to 214) are in one context and related to each other.

Or do you think that you would enter the Garden: It concludes what was described in the previous verse: Religion is a guidance from God to lead mankind to what contains their prosperity and happiness in this world and the hereafter; and it is a grace of God bestowed upon them. Therefore, it is essential for them to submit themselves to this religion, without following in the footsteps of Satan. They should not create differences in it and should not turn the medicine itself into a disease; they should not change the bounty of God into disbelief and ingratitude, by following their lust and desire, and seeking the trinkets of this world and its decorations. If they do so, they will incur the wrath of God, as happened in the case of the Israelites when they perverted the bounty of God given to them. They must remember that the trial is continuing and the test is in progress. They also will be tested as the previous people were put to test; and no one will get the bliss of religion and nearness to God, the Lord of the worlds, except through fortitude and complete submission to His commands.

almizan.org

The first two verses were addressed directly to the believers, then the

style was changed, treating them in the third person, finally in this verse they are addressed again in the second person, treating them as present. The fact is that the whole talk is with them and they are the real audience. But the style was changed in the middle verses for some good reasons (for example, those verses contained the topics of chastisement and punishment). When the purpose was served, once again a direct address was resumed.

The word *am* (or) gives here the meaning of "but." It is made for "or," but the context of the verses gives it the following meaning: Do you intend to devote yourselves solely to what I have told you—to submit to Me, to believe in Me and to remain steadfast on the right path of religion, maintaining unity and cooperation—Or do you not; but *think that you would enter the Garden …*

… while yet the like of those who have passed away before you has not come to you: *mathal* and *mithl* are used for that likeness which creates a picture of the thing for which it is used in the mind of the hearer.

Mathal (adage) is generally used for a saying or story which brings to mind the intended meaning in the shape of an illustrative metaphor, as God says: *The similitude* (mathal) *of those who were placed under the Torah then they did not hold it, is as the similitude of the donkey bearing books …* (62:5) Also, *mathal* is used in the meaning of adjectives, as God says: *See how they coin comparisons* (amthāl) *for you …* (25:9) They were using for him adjectives like insane, bewitching, lying, and so on.

In this verse, the word *mathal* is used in the first meaning, because the similitude is explained in the words, *distress and affliction befell them …*

… distress and affliction befell them and they were shaken violently: When a short reference was made to *the like of those who have passed away before you,* the audience became anxious to know what had befallen them. Then God described it in detail in these words, *distress and affliction befell them …*

Distress (*baʾsāʾ*) is that hardship which befalls a man outside his person, like to property, prestige, family or in the general law and order of the society. Affliction (*ḍarrʾ*) means that hardship which befalls him in his person, like a wound, murder, sickness, and so on. *Zalzalah* and *zilzāl* means an earthquake. Its root is *zalla* which means 'slipped up,' 'stumbled.' The root word is repeated in this verb to imply repeated stumbling and slipping up. Anyhow the word is metaphorically used for being agitated and

disturbed, and that is why we have translated it "were shaken violently."

… so that the messenger and those who believe with him said: When will the help of Allah come? Apparently it was the saying of the Messenger and the believers together. There can be no objection as to why the Messenger should utter such words. He might have exclaimed so to seek the help of God which He had promised in these verses: *And certainly Our word has already gone forth in respect of Our servants, the messengers, most surely they shall be the assisted ones* (37:171-172). Also He said, *Allah has written down: I will most certainly prevail, I and my messengers* (58:21).

God says: *Until when the messengers despaired and deemed they were indeed told a lie, Our help came to them …* (12:110) We may see that the tone of this verse is far harsher than the verse under discussion.

Now, surely the help of Allah is nigh: Apparently this is God's answer to the call of the Messenger and the believers.

It has already been mentioned that the verse proves that the test and trial of the people will continue in this nation also as it did for the previous ones. Also, it shows that if the same actions and attitudes appear again, the same consequences will follow. It is true in the religion also, as historians say that history repeats itself.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verse 215

سْأَلُونَكَ مَاذَا يُنْفِقُونَ ۖ قُلْ مَا أَنْفَقْتُمْ مِنْ خَيْرٍ فَلِلْوَالِدَيْنِ وَالْأَقْرَبِينَ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ
وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ ۗ وَمَا تَفْعَلُوا مِنْ خَيْرٍ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ بِهِ عَلِيمٌ ﴿٢١٥﴾

(2:215) ***They ask you as to what they should spend. Say: Whatever of good you spend, it is for the parents, and the near of kin, and the orphans, and the poor, and the wayfarer; and whatever of good you do Allah surely knows it.***

Commentary

They ask you as to what they should spend. Say: Whatever of good you spend … The scholars say that the style of this verse is a philosophical one. The questioners had asked about *what they should spend*. But that question was foolish, because one does not need divine revelation to know that what is spent is wealth in all its various shapes. Rather, they should have asked: Whom the wealth should be spent for. Therefore, God mentioned, instead, the deserving beneficiaries, which the questioners should have asked in the first place.

It is good reasoning; but those scholars have left out one important point. Even though the verse did not reply to their question directly, it has touched on it, and has hinted at the reply in two places: *Whatever of good you spend* and *whatever of good you do*. The verse, therefore, shows that the thing to be spent is wealth, irrespective of its shape and quantity; and that spending it on worthy beneficiaries is a good deed and God knows it very well; then it makes them aware that they should rather have asked the names of the beneficiaries, and guides them in this respect by giving the list: the parents, the near relatives, the orphans, the poor and the wayfarer.

One finds in the commentaries of the Qur'an some strange explanations of this verse:

One of them says: "what" (*mā*) in *what they should spend* was not used by the questioners to enquire about the quiddity and essence of the thing which should be spent, because it is from the terminology of logic, and is

not worthy of any literary speech of eloquent style, let alone the Qur'an which is the purest of the Arabic literature. Rather the word "what" was used for "how"; they wanted to know how they should spend their wealth and on whom. Accordingly, the verse answered that question. The reply, therefore, is according to the question, and the reasoning of the scholars of eloquence (given earlier) is out of place.

Someone else went a step further. He said: It is true that "what" is used to ask about the essence; even then, the questioners' aim was to ask as to "how" they should spend. It was known that "what" is spent is wealth. As this was well-known, there was no risk of their being misunderstood; the hearer was bound to understand that they wanted to ask about "how." It is like the verse: they said: *Call on your Lord for our sake to make it plain to us what she is, for surely to us all the cows are alike …* (2:70). They knew that the cow is an animal having such shape and such characteristics. Therefore, the words what she is could not be taken to mean that they wanted to know its quiddity—its genus and species. The only possible meaning, thus, was that they wanted to know the particulars of that cow so that they might distinguish it from the others. That is why they were given the reply, He (Moses) said: *He [Allah] says, surely she is a cow not made submissive that she should plough the land …* (2:71).

Both the commentators seem confused. It is true that *mā* (what) is not used in language to ask about the quiddity of a thing, according to the terminology of logic—for a definition made up of the nearest genus and species. But it does not mean that it is made for the question about "how." It would be a linguistic mistake for the one who wants to ask, "for whom should I spend?" to say "what should I spend?"

Mā (what) is made so as to ask for the factors which might distinguish one thing from others. The reply may be given by a logical definition using the nearest genus and species, or by describing such other distinctive characteristics and qualities by which that thing may easily be recognized. The word "what" is, therefore, general and includes the logical term, but is not different from it. And certainly it is not made to ask "how." The question about the cow and its reply (2:70-71) was asked and given correctly according to the language. There was no deviation in either from the real meaning of "what"—the question was about distinguishing factors of a thing.

A third one said: As the quiddity and essence was well-known, there was no alternative but to divert the word "what" to mean "how."

It is a manifest error. That the answer is well-known, is no justification for changing the meaning of a word to mean something quite different.

There is one more strange explanation: The questioners had asked both questions—what should they spend, and where. The Qur'an mentioned only the first question and omitted the second, because the reply pointed to it. What nonsense!

Now, we come back to the verse. There is no doubt that there is here a diversion, in the main reply, from the asked question, to remind the people that the question worthy of asking was "where," not "what," they should spend, because it was no secret that spending is done from wealth and riches.

We find in the Qur'an that it often diverts its speech from one meaning to another, to point out that the new topic is more worthy of attention. It is a style of beauty which is difficult to find in other books. See for example:

And the parable of those who disbelieve is the parable of one who shouts to that which hears not but a call and a cry … (2:17)

(Here the parable has been diverted to a satire against the idols.)

The likeness of what they spend in the life of this world is as the likeness of a wind in which is intense cold, [that] smote upon the tillage of a people who had done injustice to their souls, and destroyed it (3:117).

(The parable is diverted from the wealth spent to its ultimate forfeiture.)

The parable of those who spend their wealth in the way of Allah is as the parable of a grain growing seven ears, in every ear there are a hundred grains; and Allah multiplies for whom He pleases; … (2:261)

(The parable is diverted from those who spend in the way of God to the manifold increase in its reward.)

The day on which neither property will avail nor sons, except him who comes to Allah with a heart free [from evil] (26:88-89).

(Instead of praising the heart, free from evil, the believer is praised who has got that heart, to show the importance of the believer.)

Say: I do not ask you aught of recompense for it, except that he who will, may take the way to his Lord (25:57).

Glory be to Allah [for freedom] from what they describe, except the servants of Allah, the purified ones (37:159-160). There are many such verses.

… and whatever of good you do, Allah surely knows it: The word spending has been changed here to "doing good"; likewise, in the beginning of the verse "wealth" was changed to "good" ("whatever of good

you spend").

This change guides us to two principles:

First: It is very much recommended that one should spend one's wealth on the recognized beneficiaries—it does not matter whether the amount is small or large. But what matters is that the thing spent should be "good," desirable and likeable. God says: *Never shall you attain to righteousness until you spend [benevolently] out of what you love* (3:91); *O you who believe! Spend [benevolently] out of the good things that you have earned and what We have brought forth for you out of the earth; and do not aim at what is bad that you may spend of it [in charity] while you would not take it yourselves unless you connive at it …* (2:267).

Second: The spending should not be in a bad manner. The spending should be without reminding the receiver reproachfully of it or injuring his feelings. God says: *… then do not follow up what they have spent with obligation [reproach] or injury …*(2:262); *And they ask you as to what they should spend. Say: Whatever can be spared …* (2:219).

Examining Narrations

(1) There is a saying of Ibn ʿAbbās that he said: "I did not see any people better than the companions of Muḥammad. They did not ask him except thirteen questions till he was taken away (from this world), all of those (questions) are in the Qur'an. Among them are: 'They ask you about the intoxicants and games of chance'; 'They ask you about the sacred month'; 'They ask you about the orphans'; 'They ask you about the menses'; 'They ask you about the booty'; 'They ask you as to what they should spend.' They never asked but what was (practical) to them." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(2) It is written in *Majmaʿ al-bayān* that this verse was revealed about ʿAmr b. al-Jamūḥ; he was a very old man of great wealth. He said: "O Messenger of God! What should I give in charity and to whom?" Then God revealed this verse.

Author's comment: This tradition has also been narrated in *al-Durr al-manthūr* through Ibn al-Mundhir from Ibn Ḥayyān. But the scholars have said that this tradition is weak. Apart from the weakness in the chain of narrators, it is not in conformity with the verse, because the verse mentions only one question as to what should be spent, and not on whom.

(3) Similarly, two other traditions reported in that book do not conform with the verse. The first is narrated through Ibn Jarīr and Ibn al-Mundhir from Ibn Jarīḥ that he said: "The believers asked the Messenger of God where they should put (that is, spend) their wealth. So, the verse was revealed: They ask you as to what they should spend. Say: 'Whatever of good you spend …' This, then, is voluntary (non-obligatory) expenditure; and *zakāt* is different from all of it."

(4) The second one is narrated from al-Suddī that he said: The day when this verse was revealed, there was no *zakāt*. It is (about) the spending what one does on one's family and the alms one gives away. Then (the law of) *zakāt* abrogated it.

Author's comment: It is clear that the relation between the verse of *zakāt* (Take alms out of their wealth—9:103) and this verse is not of abrogation at all. Or does the word "abrogation" mean something else in their language?

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verses 216-218

almizan.org

كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْقِتَالُ وَهُوَ كُرْهٌ لَكُمْ ۖ وَعَسَىٰ أَنْ تَكْرَهُوا شَيْئًا وَهُوَ خَيْرٌ
لَكُمْ ۖ وَعَسَىٰ أَنْ تُحِبُّوا شَيْئًا وَهُوَ شَرٌّ لَكُمْ ۗ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ وَأَنْتُمْ لَا تَعْلَمُونَ ﴿٢١٦﴾
يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ قِتَالٍ فِيهِ ۖ قُلْ قِتَالٌ فِيهِ كَبِيرٌ ۖ وَصَدٌّ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ
وَكُفْرٌ بِهِ وَالْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ وَإِخْرَاجُ أَهْلِهِ مِنْهُ أَكْبَرُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ ۚ وَالْفِتْنَةُ أَكْبَرُ
مِنَ الْقَتْلِ ۗ وَلَا يَزَالُونَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ حَتَّىٰ يَرُدُّوكُمْ عَنْ دِينِكُمْ إِنِ اسْتَطَاعُوا ۚ
وَمَنْ يَرْتَدِدْ مِنْكُمْ عَنْ دِينِهِ فَيَمُتْ وَهُوَ كَافِرٌ فَأُولَٰئِكَ حَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فِي
الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ ۖ وَأُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ ۖ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ ﴿٢١٧﴾ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا
وَالَّذِينَ هَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أُولَٰئِكَ يَرْجُونَ رَحْمَتَ اللَّهِ ۚ وَاللَّهُ غَفُورٌ
رَحِيمٌ ﴿٢١٨﴾

(2:216) *Fighting has been prescribed for you, and it is [an object of] dislike to you; and it may be that you dislike a thing while it is good for you, and it may be that you love a thing while it is evil for you; and Allah knows, while you do not know.*

(2:217) *They ask you concerning the sacred month about fighting in it. Say: Fighting in it is a grave matter; and hindering [men] from Allah's way and denying it, and [hindering men from] the Sacred Mosque and turning its people out of it are still graver with Allah, and the mischief is graver than the killing; and they will go on fighting with you so that they may turn you back from your religion if they can; and whoever of you turns back from his religion, then dies while an unbeliever - these it is whose deeds are forfeited in this world and the hereafter; and they are the inmates of the fire; therein shall they abide.*

(2:218) *Surely those who believed and those who fled [their home] and strove hard in the way of Allah, these hope for the mercy of Allah; and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.*

Commentary

almizan.org

كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْقِتَالُ وَهُوَ كُرْهٌ لَّكُمْ ۖ وَعَسَىٰ أَن تَكْرَهُوا شَيْئًا وَهُوَ خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ ۖ وَعَسَىٰ أَن تُحِبُّوا شَيْئًا وَهُوَ شَرٌّ لَّكُمْ ۗ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ وَأَنتُمْ لَا تَعْلَمُونَ ﴿٢١٦﴾

(2:216) ***Fighting has been prescribed for you, and it is [an object of] dislike to you; and it may be that you dislike a thing while it is good for you, and it may be that you love a thing while it is evil for you; and Allah knows, while you do not know.***

It has been repeatedly explained that *kitābah* (writing), which has been translated here as prescription, means an obligatory command, if used in the matter of legislation, and a firm decree, if used in the matter of creation. This verse, therefore, shows that fighting in the way of God is compulsory for all believers (as the verse is addressed to them) except those who are exempted by other verses or traditions. For example: *There is no blame [in staying behind] on the weak, nor on the sick, nor on those who do not find what they should spend, so long as they are sincere to Allah and His Messenger … nor on those who when they came to you that you might carry them, you said: I cannot find that on which to carry you …* (9:91-92).

The verb, *kutiba* (has been written) is in the passive voice, because it is followed by the phrase, and it is (an object of) dislike to you. It was not proper to mention clearly the name of the writer (that is, God) of a writing which was to be an object of dislike to the believers. By not using the active voice, the verse protected the sanctity of the divine name and removed every chance of slight to it.

Kurh (dislike) is the hardship felt by man in his self, naturally or otherwise. *Karh* (compulsion) is the hardship forced upon him by extraneous agencies as when he is forced to do a work which he does not like to do. God says: *… it is not lawful for you that you should take women as heritage against [their] will …* (4:19); *… so He said to it and to the earth: Come both, willingly or unwillingly …* (4:11).

Why was the ordained fighting to be an object of dislike to the believers? Three explanations have been given for it:

(1) Fighting entails loss of limbs and lives, economic hard ship, monetary loss and the deterioration of law and order; goods necessary for life disappear from the market and become scarce; and many other things crop up in society which man dislikes by nature. God has praised the believers in His book and said that a group of them were sincere in their faith and successful in their endeavours. But, at the same time, He has admonished another group of them because of their shaky belief and crooked thinking, as may be seen in the verses revealed about the battles of Badr, Uḥud and Khandaq and so on. The people addressed by this verse were, therefore, of two types: One, steadfast in their faith, who could not dislike any command of God; the other, those who might dislike them, and this second group was more numerous. Therefore, it was quite in order to describe such a mixed group as disliking an order, especially when those disliking it were in the majority.

(2) The believers were aware that the unbelievers were well-prepared for fighting and had more strength and material support than the Muslims. They, therefore, thought that fighting at that particular time would not be in the interests of the Muslims; hence, the order to fight should be delayed for some other suitable time. This postponement would give them time to increase their manpower, war-material and martial strength. God told them in this verse that they were mistaken in this view, because God in this affair has a purpose which shall surely be attained; He knows the hidden reality of everything while their knowledge is confined only to the apparent facts.

(3) The believers were well-trained by the Qur'an, and, accordingly, they felt clemency towards the creatures of God, and mercy and pity had become second nature to them. They did not like fighting with the unbelievers, as it meant that a number of their adversaries would die in disbelief, and the believers were not pleased about that. They would have liked to deal with those adversaries with good humour, and live with them with nobleness and gentleness, inviting them to Islam with good exhortation, hoping that they would come to the right path. They thought that in this way, they would protect themselves from death, and the unbelievers from dying in disbelief and entering into eternal fire.

God, in this verse, made it clear that this thought of theirs was not correct. God, Who ordained the fighting knew very well that the call of truth would have no effect on those misguided souls who were spiritually

a total failure. The true religion could not expect any good from them either in this world or in the next. They were in humanity like a totally degenerated limb which will certainly infect other organs if not removed from the body by a surgical operation.

These are the explanations given for the words of God, and it is (an object of) dislike to you. But the first one is the most appropriate, especially if we look at the verses admonishing a group of believers (referred to in the explanation) and keep in view the passive voice of the verb, has been written on you, that is, has been prescribed for you.

… and it may be that you dislike a thing while it is good for you: It has already been explained that the words like "may be" and "perhaps," when used in divine speech, mean "it is hoped." This hope is related not to the speaker (God) but to the hearers. In other words, when God says: may be it is so it does not mean that He hopes it will be so (Elevated be He from such uncertainties!); rather it means that the hearers should hope or expect it in this way.

The repetition of "may be" in this sentence and the following one (and it may be that you love a thing while it is evil for you) means that the believers disliked fighting and loved peace; so God told them that they were mistaken in both. If the sentence is framed without repeating the word "may be" (that is, 'and it may be that you dislike a thing while it is good for you or love a thing while it is evil for you') it will convey the idea that "your dislike and love have no significance, because such feelings are often misplaced." Such a sentence is addressed to the one who .has erred in something, for example, if one dislikes meeting a certain person. But if he has erred in two things—example, he dislikes mixing with the people and loves seclusion—then the norms of elocution demand that he should be warned against both tendencies, example, 'you are neither justified in your dislike, nor are you right in your love; it may be that you dislike a thing while it is good for you, and it may be that you love a thing and it is evil for you; because you do not know the unseen, and, therefore, you cannot find your way towards the hidden realities of any thing.' As the believers, in addition to their dislike of fighting, also loved peace and ease (as is implied in the previous verse: or do you think that you would enter the Garden while yet the like of those who passed away before you has not come upon you). God pointed to both mistakes in two separate sentences: it may be that you dislike … and it may be that you love …

… and Allah knows while you do not know: This is the final step in making their mistake known to them. God has gradually made them realize that they were in manifest error. To begin with, He told them that it was possible that they were mistaken in their dislike of the fighting (it may be that you dislike …). Their minds accepted the implication of those two sentences; and thus they were freed from their compound ignorance, as now they felt doubtful about the correctness of their views. When that stage was reached, God told them clearly that the order which you dislike, is ordained by Him who is not unaware of the hidden realities of the things, while your views are based on your psyche which knows only that much which it has been allowed by God to know. Therefore, it is incumbent upon you to leave all such decisions into His hand.

The verse proves that knowledge, in its reality and totality, is God's only; and others have no knowledge of their own at all. This reality is explained in many other verses: God, surely nothing is hidden from Him … (3:5), and they cannot comprehend anything out of His knowledge except what He pleases … (2:255). And some explanation about fighting has been given in the verse 2:190, And fight in the way of God …

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ قِتَالٍ فِيهِ ۖ قُلْ قِتَالٌ فِيهِ كَبِيرٌ ۖ وَصَدٌّ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَكُفْرٌ بِهِ وَالْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ وَإِخْرَاجُ أَهْلِهِ مِنْهُ أَكْبَرُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ ۚ وَالْفِتْنَةُ أَكْبَرُ مِنَ الْقَتْلِ ۗ وَلَا يَزَالُونَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ حَتَّىٰ يَرُدُّوكُمْ عَنْ دِينِكُمْ إِنِ اسْتَطَاعُوا ۚ وَمَنْ يَرْتَدِدْ مِنْكُمْ عَنْ دِينِهِ فَيَمُتْ وَهُوَ كَافِرٌ فَأُولَٰئِكَ حَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ ۖ وَأُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ ۖ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ ﴿٢١٧﴾

(2:217) ***They ask you concerning the sacred month about fighting in it. Say: Fighting in it is a grave matter; and hindering [men] from Allah's way and denying it, and [hindering men from] the Sacred Mosque and turning its people out of it are still graver with Allah, and the mischief is graver than the killing; and they will go on fighting with you so that they may turn you back from your religion if they can; and whoever of you turns back from his religion, then dies while an unbeliever - these it is whose deeds are forfeited in this world and the hereafter; and they are the inmates of the fire; therein shall they abide.***

The verse contains the prohibition of fighting in the sacred month. Then it goes on to say that disbelief and turning the people of the Sacred Mosque out of it are far graver sins and that the mischief is graver than the killing. These sentences show that there must have occurred some incident which prompted the believers to ask the question, and that there was some killing in that incident, but that killing was not intentional. (See the last verse: *Surely those who believed … these hope for the mercy of God.*) All these pointers confirm what has been described in the traditions that some believers had killed an unbeliever unknowingly in the sacred month in a battle, and that the unbelievers had ridiculed the Muslims for it. The incident was that of ʿAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh and his companions.

Say, fighting, in it is a grave matter; and hindering [men] from Allah's way and denying it and [hindering men from] the Sacred Mosque …: "God's way" means worship and virtuous actions and especially the pilgrimage (hajj). Apparently the pronoun "it" in "denying it" refers to "God's way"; thus it would mean denial in practice, not in faith. And "the Sacred Mosque" is in conjunction with "God's way," and means 'hindering from God's way and the Sacred Mosque.'

The verse clearly shows that fighting in the sacred month is forbidden.

It has been said that this verse was abrogated by the verse: *then slay the idolaters wherever you find them* (9:5) But this view is not correct, and some explanation about it have been given in the commentary of the verses of fighting.

and turning its people out of it are still graver with Allah, and the mischief is graver than the killing: What the idolators had done—turning the Messenger of God and the believers out of the Sacred Mosque (and they were truly the people of the Sacred Mosque)—is far graver than fighting. And the mischief done by them in rebuking the believers and calling them back to disbelief is graver than killing. Therefore, they have no right to reprove the believers for killing when they themselves had committed far graver sins. So far as the believers are concerned, they still hope for the mercy of God, and God is Forgiving, Merciful.

and they will go on fighting with you so that they may turn you back …: *ḥatta* means "till"; but here it signifies cause or purpose. That is why it has been translated here as "so that."

and whoever of you turns back … these it is whose deeds are forfeited … and they are inmates of fire: It threatens apostates with the forfeiture

of their deeds and an eternal abode in the Fire.

Forfeiture of Deeds

Forfeiture (*ḥabṭ*) means nullification of a deed and invalidity of its effects. Whenever this word is used in the Qur'an, it is always related to deeds; for example, *Surely, if you associate [others with God], your deed will certainly be forfeit and you will certainly be of the losers* (39:65); *Surely those who disbelieve and turn away from God's way and oppose the Messenger, after that guidance has become clear to them, cannot harm God in any way, and He shall make null their deeds. O you who believe! Obey God and obey the, Messenger, and do not make your deeds of no effect* (47:32-33). If we compare the last phrases of both verses, we shall see that the nullifying of the deeds is the same as the deeds being of no effect. This meaning is more clearly seen in the verses: *and what they wrought in it shall be forfeit, and vain [null and void] is what they do* (11:16); *And nearer to it is the word of God, And We will proceed to what they have done of deeds, so We shall render them as scattered floating dust* (25:23).

In short, *ḥabṭ* of deeds means their coming to nothing and their being of no effect. It has been said that it is derived from *ḥabaṭa* which is used when an animal over-eats and its stomach distends, often resulting in its death.

The effect of forfeiture (*ḥabṭ*) as described by God, is nullification of the deed in both worlds, here as well as in the hereafter. Forfeiture has a connection with the deeds and it affects the life hereafter. The faith beautifies this world's life as well as it makes the life hereafter a pleasant one. God says: *Whoever does good, whether male or female, and he is a believer, We will most certainly make him live a happy life, and We shall most certainly give them their reward for the best of what they did (*16:97). Also it is clear, without any shadow of doubt, that the endeavours of the unbeliever are lost and his deeds are of no effect in this world; and it is especially true in the case of the man who turns back towards infidelity, leaving the true faith. His heart cuts itself away from its anchor in this stormy life—the anchor being belief in the One and only God. He has nowhere to turn—where he can express his joyful thanks when blessed with a bounty, find solace when confronted with a misfortune, and to whom he can pray when in need of something. God says: *Is he who was dead then We raised him to life and made for him a light by which he walks among the people,*

like him whose likeness is that of one in utter darkness whence he cannot come forth? (6:123). This verse shows that the believer has in this world a good life and a light in his actions which the disbeliever does not possess. Also God says: … *then whoever follows My guidance, he shall not go astray nor be unhappy. And whoever turns away from My remembrance, his shall surely be a straitened life, and We will raise him, on the day of resurrection, blind* (20:124). This verse also proves that the life of the unbeliever in this world is a straitened one, full of difficulties, and that a believer's life, in contrast, is a blessed, happy and pleasant one.

All this explanation, together with the cause of both groups' happiness and unhappiness respectively, is given in this short verse: *That is because Allah is the Master of those who believe, and because the unbelievers have no master for them* (47:11).

It appears from the above details that deeds (*aʿmāl*) here means all the actions done by a man so as to attain happiness in life. The meaning of "deeds" in this context is not confined to the apostate's acts of worship and other virtuous deeds done by him when he was a Muslim. Moreover, the forfeiture of deeds has been mentioned even in connection with those who do not perform any act of worship, for example, disbelievers and hypocrites. It clearly proves that it is not only acts of worship which are forfeited. See, for example, the verses: *O you who believe! If you help [the cause of] God He will help you and make firm your feet. And [as for] those who disbelieve, for them is destruction, and He has let their deeds go astray. That is because they disliked what God revealed, so He rendered their deeds null* (47:7-9); *Surely [as for] those who disbelieve in the signs of God and slay the prophets unjustly and slay those among men who enjoin justice, announce to them a painful chastisement. Those are they whose deeds shall become null in this world, as well as the hereafter, and they shall have no helpers* (3:21-22). There are many verses like these.

The gist of the verse under discussion, like other verses of forfeiture, is that disbelief and apostasy make the deeds ineffective, that is, such deeds lose their power to make life blissful. On the other hand, true faith and belief give life to the deeds and they create felicity, bliss and happiness in life. If someone acquires true faith after disbelief, his deeds are given a new life and they become effective in making life blessed and happy (although they were forfeit and ineffective before). Likewise, if he apostatizes after having been a believer, all his deeds become dead, null

and void; they cannot make life in this world or in the here after happy. Thereafter, if he leaves his apostasy and comes back to the fold of Islam, it is hoped that his deeds will be revived; but if he dies in the apostasy, the forfeiture will have been confirmed and misery and unhappiness will be written down for him.

This explanation is enough to show that the controversy about the forfeiture of the deeds of an apostate—whether it is effected at the time of apostasy or at his death—is baseless. That controversy is as follows:

Some people say that those deeds of an apostate which were done before his apostasy remain preserved until his death, and that if he does not return to the true faith before his death, they will become forfeit on his death. Their argument is based on this very verse which is under discussion: and whoever of you turns back from his religion, then dies while an unbeliever—these it is whose deeds are forfeited in this world and the hereafter … They also bring in their support the verse: *On the day when they shall see the angels … And We will proceed to what they have done of deeds, so we shall render them as scattered floating dust* (25:22-23). This verse describes the condition of unbelievers at the time of death; and it implies that if the apostate had returned to the true belief, those deeds which he had done before apostasy would have remained valid.

Others say that apostasy nullifies deeds completely; and they do not return to him even if he comes back to the true belief. Of course, the deeds done after his return to the true belief do belong to him. According to them, the verse contains the words, "then dies while an unbeliever" because it purports to show the condition of all his actions done during his life in this world.

But the explanation given by us shows that there is no ground here at all for any such controversy. The verse in fact conveys the meaning that all his actions and deeds become ineffective in the meaning that they cannot bring any bliss, felicity or happiness in his life.

There are two other questions here, somewhat related with the above one: The first is the theory of *iḥbāṭ*. It is the theory that good and evil deeds cancel each other.

Some people said that actions cancel and invalidate each other. These people are further divided in two groups: One says that every subsequent evil deed cancels the preceding good one, and vice versa. It means that at any given time a man has in his account either good only or evil only.

The other group says that there is a system of counterbalancing good and evil deeds; the weight of the lighter side is deducted from the weightier side, the balance remaining on account. This theory, like the previous one, means that at the end there remains in the man's account only good or only evil actions—if any balance is left after the said counter balancing.

Both these views are wrong, because:

First: God says in the Qur'an; *And others have confessed their faults, they have mingled a good deed and an evil one, maybe Allah will turn to them [mercifully]; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful* (9:102). This verse clearly says that there are some good deeds and some evil ones, and that they will remain written in the account of the doer in their original form until the mercy of God decides about them. This cuts away the roots of the theory of cancellation with all its interpretations.

Second: God uses the same system of reward and punishment that is used by reasonable men in this world—rewarding the good deed and punishing the evil one, each separate from the other. Of course, if one commits a sin that cuts away the relationship between Master and servant (example, disbelief or idolatry), then all his deeds become forfeit. There are numerous verses to prove it; and there is no need to quote them here.

The second related question is the theory of *takfīr* which is the belief that the actions do not cancel each other; every action is preserved—a good action has its own effect and an evil one its own. But, as clearly mentioned in the Qur'an, a good deed sometimes atones for, and removes, an evil one. God says: *O you who believe! If you fear Allah, He will grant you a distinction and remove from you your evil …* (8:29); *then whoever hastens off in two days, there is no sin on him, and whoever tarries [there] is no sin on him* (2:203); *If you avoid the great sins which you are forbidden, We will expiate from you your [small] sins …* (4:31).

Not only this, but some good deeds change an evil action into a good one, as God says: *Except him who repents and believes and does a good deed; so these are they of whom Allah changes the evil deeds to good ones; and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful* (25:70).

There is another matter which is like the basis of all these questions: When and where does the doer become entitled to recompense? Some have said: it is the time of the action. Others have said: the time of death. Still others have said: the hereafter. And a fourth group has said: it is the time of the action but only if the doer continues in the same condition

up to his death.

Every group offers various verses of the Qur'an in support of its view, and some add some rational argument too.

Let us say that reward and punishment, forfeiture and atonement are the effects of the deeds themselves (as we have explained in our commentary of verse 2:26[1]). It follows that the human soul, as long as it is connected with the body, is subject to changes in its qualities. When man does something good, there appears in his soul a spiritual quality which entitles it to receive the reward; and when he commits a sin, the spiritual quality appearing in his soul entitles it to receive chastisement. As man in this world is subject to change from one condition to other, (because he continues to mingle good deeds with evil ones), his present spiritual quality may possibly be changed to its opposite as a result of his subsequent deeds. This goes on till death overtakes him. The soul departs from the body, actions stop, changes cease, potentialities come to an end, and qualities acquired up to that time are firmly established in his soul in a way that it no longer accepts any change or alteration (except through the mercy of God or intercession by His chosen servants).

Or let us say, as we have said earlier, that God uses the same system of recompense as is used by reasonable men in this world. It means that obedience or disobedience to divine laws and their recompense follows the same method which is seen in social laws. Reasonable people praise and commend the law-abiding and obedient man as soon as he does something good, and condemn a disobedient man as soon as he does something wrong. But, at the same time, they know that the said commendation or condemnation may be changed in the future, because the man concerned may alter his ways. In short, the praise or condemnation is offered at once, but its continuation depends on the man's continuing in the same way in the future. But an ever-lasting praise or ever-lasting condemnation, not subject to any further change, will attach to him when there is no longer any possibility of change in his quality, that is, by death or by the loss of potentiality.

These explanations are enough to show that all the above mentioned views on this subject have, in one way or the other, deviated from the truth, because they have based their discourse on wrong premises.

---

1 See Eng. vol. 1 (Ed.)

The truth is as follows:

First: A man becomes entitled to reward or punishment as soon as he does whatever he does; but that reward or punishment is still subject to change or alteration. It is only on death that it is confirmed without any possibility of alteration, as we have described above.

Second: The same is the case with the forfeiture of deeds as a result of disbelief, and so on. The deeds become forfeited as soon as the man disbelieves, and so on. But the forfeiture is confirmed at death.

Third: Forfeiture applies not only to the deeds related to the hereafter, but to those connected with this world also.

Fourth: *Iḥbāṭ*, that is, the theory of good and evil deeds cancelling each other is wrong. But *takfīr* is correct—the belief that good actions sometimes expiate evil ones.

An Essay on the Rules Governing Actions

A) About Their Reward and Punishment:

There are various rules about the actions of man and their recompense, which are enumerated here:

(1) There are some sins which cause the forfeiture of good deeds in this world and the hereafter. One is apostasy. God says in the verse under discussion: and whoever of you turns back from his religion then dies while an unbeliever, these it is whose deeds are forfeited in this world and the hereafter.

Other such sin is disbelief in the signs of God and enmity towards them. God says: *Surely [as for] those who disbelieve in the signs of Allah and slay the prophets unjustly and slay those among men who enjoin justice, announce to them a painful chastisement. Those are they whose works shall become null in this world as well as the hereafter …* (3:20-21).

Likewise, there are some acts of obedience, like (submission to) Islam and repentance, that expiate the evil deeds of this world as well as the hereafter; God says: *Say: O My servants! Who have acted extravagantly against their own souls, do not des pair of the mercy of Allah; Surely Allah forgives the faults [sins] altogether; surely He is the Forgiving, the Merciful. And return to your Lord [repent before Him] and submit to Him before there comes to you the punishment, then you shall not be helped. And follow the best that has been revealed to you from your Lord …* (39:53-55). Also, he

says: … *then whoever follows My guidance, he shall not go astray nor be unhappy. And whoever turns away from My remembrance, his shall surely be a straitened life, and We will raise him, on the day of resurrection, blind* (20:123-124).

(2) There are some sins which cause the forfeiture of some of good deeds. Such, for example, is opposition to the Prophet. God says: *Surely those who disbelieve and turn away from Allah's way and oppose the Messenger after that guidance has become clear to them, cannot harm Allah in any way, and He shall make null their deeds. O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger, and do not make your deeds of no effect [null and void]* (47:32-33).

A comparison between the two sentences implies that the order of "obedience" of the Messenger is the same as the prohibition of his opposition, and *ibṭāl* (nullification of the deed) is its forfeiture.

Another such sin is raising one's voice above the voice of the Prophet. God says: *O you who believe! Do not raise your voices above the voice of the Prophet, and do not speak loud to him as you speak loud to one another, lest your deeds become null while you do not perceive* (49:2).

Likewise, there are some acts of obedience which expiate and atone some sins. Such are the obligatory prayers, hajj and the avoidance of great sins. God says:

About prayer: *And establish prayer in the two ends of the day and at the approaches of the night; surely good deeds take away the evil deeds; this is reminder to the mindful* (11:114).

About hajj: *then whoever hastens off in two days, there is no sin on him, and whoever tarries [there], there is no sin on him* (2:203).

About avoidance of great sins: *If you avoid the great sins which you are forbidden, We will expiate from you your [small] sins …* (4:31).

Those who avoid the great sins and the indecencies except small sins [or just passing thoughts]; surely your Lord is liberal in forgiving (53:32).

(3) There are some sins which transfer the good deeds from their doer to someone else. Murder is one of those sins. God says: *Verily I intend that you bear my sin and [also] your sin …* (5:29).

Other such sins, according to the traditions of the Prophet and the imams of Ahl al-Bayt are backbiting and calumny, and others.

There are, likewise, some acts of obedience which transfer the evil deeds from the doer to someone else, as will be explained later.

(4) There are some sins which transfer to the doer evil deeds similar to those committed by another person. God says: *That they may bear their own burdens entirely on the day of resurrection and also of the burdens of those whom they lead astray without knowledge* (16:25); *And most certainly they shall carry their own burdens, and other burdens with their own burdens* (29:13).

In the same way, some acts of obedience transfer to the doer good deeds similar to those done by another person. God says: *and We write down what they have sent before and their foot prints …* (36:12).

(5) Some sins cause double punishment. God says: *In that case We would certainly have made you to taste a double [punishment] in this life and a double [punishment] after death …* (17:75); *… the punishment shall be increased to her doubly* (33:30).

On the other hand, there are some good deeds which bring double reward or even more. God says about spending in the way of God: The parable of those who spend their wealth in the way of God is as parable of a grain growing seven ears, in every ear there are a hundred grain; *and Allah multiplies for whom He pleases* (2:261). Also He says; *These shall be granted their reward twice* (28:54); *He will give you two portions of His mercy, and make for you a light with which you will walk, and forgive you* (57:28).

Moreover all good deeds get their rewards multiplied manifold, as God says: *Whoever brings a good deed, he shall have ten like it …* (6:161).

(6) Some good actions change the evil deeds into good ones. *Allah says: Except him who repents and believes and does a good deed; so these are they of whom Allah changes the evil deeds to good ones …* (25:70).[1]

(7) There are some good deeds whose like is given to other than the doer (without the doer losing it or its reward). God says: *And [as for] those who believe and their offspring follow them in faith, We will unite with them their offspring and We will not diminish to them aught of their work …* (52:21).

The same may happen about some evil deeds. For example, if one oppresses orphans it brings the same type of oppression on his own

1 The author has discussed in detail how evil deeds (first nature) changes to good ones (second nature) as a consequence of repentance and performing good deeds. See Eng. vol. 29, pages 370-372 (Ed.)

children after his death. God says: *And let those fear who, should they leave behind them weakly offspring, would fear on their account …* (4:9).

(8) Some good deeds transfer the evil deeds of the doer (let us call him Zayd) to another person (Bakr), and the good deeds of Bakr to Zayd. Likewise, some evil deeds transfer the good deeds of the doer, Zayd, to Bakr, and the evil deeds of Bakr to Zayd.

This is a surprising factor in reward and recompense, and we shall explain it in detail under verse 8:37: *So that Allah may separate the impure from the pure, and put the impure, some of it upon the other, and pile it up together, then cast it into hell …*

There are many traditions explaining the situations where the above-mentioned changes and exchanges may occur, and we shall quote them in the commentaries of these verses, God willing.

If we ponder on the various verses quoted above, we shall see that the system of the recompense of actions (their effectiveness in bringing about happiness and unhappiness) is entirely different from the system of their physical effect. For example, eating is a work which by various actions and reactions affects the eater and satisfies his hunger, but that satiation is not carried on to someone else, nor is it transferred from the eater to another person. Also, the object of the said eating is the food eaten; the eating changes the food stage by stage into various forms. But that eating cannot affect other food, nor can that food be changed or exchanged with other eaters, nor can the nature of the food be changed to something else. In the same way, if Zayd beats ʿUmar, the action is beating, not something else; the beater is Zayd, not someone else; and the beaten one is ʿUmar, not another person.

But when it comes to the effectiveness of the same actions in happiness or unhappiness, the system completely changes. *Allah says:… and they did not do Us any harm but they did harm their own souls …* (2:57); *… and the evil plan does not beset any save the authors of it* (35:43); *See how they lied against their own souls …* (6:24); *Then shall it be said to them: Where is that which you used to set up besides Allah? They shall say: They are gone away from us, nay, we used not to call upon anything before. Thus does Allah confound the unbelievers* (40:73-74).

In short, in the world of "recompense," one action is sometimes changed to another, sometimes transferred to someone other than the doer, sometimes given an opposite effect. In other words, the system of

recompense is quite different from physical causes and effects.

Question: In that case, there will be no place for reason in the world of actions and their effects, and the rule of wisdom will come to an end; nothing will remain in its real form.

Answer: It is not correct to say that reason and wisdom have no place in this scheme. God and His angels, as He has described in His Book, do offer intellectual arguments against the sinners at the time of death and in *Barzakh*; and they will offer the same type of proofs against them on the day of resurrection and in Paradise and Hell. God says: A*nd the trumpet shall be blown, so all those that are in the heavens and all those that are in the earth shall swoon, except such as Allah please; then it shall be blown again, then Lo! they shall stand up awaiting. And the earth shall beam with the light of its Lord, and the Book shall be laid down, and the prophets and the witnesses shall be brought up, and judgement shall be given between them with justice, and they shall not be dealt with unjustly. And every soul shall be paid back fully what it has done, and He knows best what they do* (39:68-70).

The Qur'an repeatedly says that God shall decide on the day of resurrection between the people with justice in that which they differed in. For example, it narrates the argument which Satan will put forth on that day: *And Satan shall say after the affair is decided: Surely Allah promised you the promise of truth, and I gave you promises then failed to keep them to you; and I had no authority over you, except that I called you and you obeyed me; therefore do not blame me but blame yourselves: I cannot be your aider [now] nor can you be my aiders; surely I disbelieved in your associating me with Allah before; surely it is the unjust that shall have the painful punishment* (14:22).

All such verses clearly show that rational arguments and proofs are not, and shall not be, abolished in the world of recompense, although that place is entirely different from this physical world.

Question: But how, then, to reconcile the two claims: that the world of recompense has its own system of reward and punishment, totally different from this world, and that reason also rules in that world?

Answer: The fact is that God has talked with people, in guiding them, in their own language, and has used the expressions of social wisdom while addressing them, and has based His speech on the principles and rules of mastership and servitude. He calls Himself Master, the men are

His slaves, the prophets are His messengers to them, He continuously maintains contact with them through commands and prohibitions, prophetic missions and admonishments, good tidings and warnings, promises and threats, and all related matters like punishment and forgiveness, and so forth.

This is the style of the Qur'an when it talks with mankind. But it has made it clear that the real affair is far above human thinking and imagination. People cannot understand it, nor can their limited intellects comprehend it. That is why it has been brought down to the level of their mental power and clothed in a language which they can understand. In this way, it has been made possible for them to know as much of the sublime truth as was necessary for their happiness and bliss. God says: *[I swear] by the book that makes manifest [the truth]: surely We made it an Arabic Qur'an so that you may understand. And surely it is in the original of the Book with Us, truly elevated, full of wisdom* (43:2-4).

It is for this reason that the Qur'an has based its description of the rules of recompense, and all related matters, on the fundamentals of social laws which are known to reasonable men and which are based on social good and evil.

It is really wonderful how those sublime realities, which are so much higher than the level of the common human intellect, can still be explained in terms of that very intellect. For example, practical social wisdom does not reject the idea of giving a harder punishment to a wrong-doer by holding him responsible for all the social evil resulting from his misdeed. Thus, a murderer may be held responsible for the loss of all social benefits and rights resulting from the death of the slain person. And a person starting an evil custom may be punished for the like misdeeds of his followers. In the first example, it may be decreed that the wrongs done apparently by the slain person, were done by the murderer; and in the second example, it may be decided that the like of the misdeeds done by the followers were also done by the initiator of that misdeed, while the followers are not free from the blame in any way—thus the deeds of the followers are the deeds of the initiator as well, and both shall be punished for them.

Similarly, there are situations in which it may be decreed that the doer of an action was not its doer, or that a particular action is in reality some other action, or that the good deeds of someone else belong to this man, or that this man shall have the like of the good deeds done by the other.

The Qur'an offers reasons for all such changes and exchanges in the world of recompense and explains them in terms of the social laws found in human society, bringing these sublime realities down to the level of the human mind, although the system of that world is totally different from this physical one, and although our social laws have a limited scope and are not valid beyond this life. It is only on the day of resurrection that those hidden realities will manifest themselves before the eyes of man. God says: *And certainly We have brought them a book which We have explained with knowledge, a guidance and a mercy for the people who believe. Do they wait for aught but its final interpretation? On the day when its final interpretation comes about, those who neglected it before will say: Indeed the apostle of our Lord had brought the truth …* (7:52-53). Also, He says: *And this Qur'an is not such as could be forged by those besides Allah, but is a verification of that which is before it and a clear explanation of the book … Nay, they rejected that of which they have no comprehensive knowledge, and its final interpretation has not yet come to them …* (10:37-39).

Question: These verses, describing such a strange system of recompense, are in conflict with other verses which say that everyone will be responsible for his own action. See for example the following verses:

> *So, he who has done an atom's weight of good shall see it. And he who has done an atom's weight of evil shall see it* (99:78).
>
> *… and no bearer of burden shall bear the burden of another …* (6:164).
>
> *… every man is responsible for what he has wrought* (52:21).
>
> *And that man shall have nothing but what he strives for* (53:39).
>
> *Surely Allah does not do any injustice to men, but men do injustice to themselves* (10:44).

There are numerous such verses, and they are diametrically opposed to the earlier-mentioned verses about this system of recompense.

Answer: Not at all. The earlier mentioned verses have decreed that the misdeeds done by a man who was slain unjustly were actually done by the unjust murderer. Now if the murderer is punished for those misdeeds, he is punished not for the deeds of the other person, but for those done by himself. Similarly, they have decided that if a man follows another in a sinful act, that action was not done by the follower alone; it is the work of the follower as well as the leader. Thus, there are two sins here, one of the follower and another of the leader. And the leader will be punished, not

for the sin of the follower, but for his own. In the same way, those verses have judged that if someone aids an oppressor in his oppression or follows a leader on the wrong path, then the said helper or follower is a partner in those misdeeds; and whatever wrong is done by that oppressor or leader, the said helper or follower is its doer to the same degree.

Thus, these people and others like them are literally and completely governed by the verses quoted in the question, such as "no bearer of burden shall bear the burden of another." Such cases are not outside the sphere of such verses; they are not in conflict with them, nor are they as an exception from the rule.

The same fact is hinted at in the verse, … *and judgement shall be given between them with justice, and they shall not be dealt with unjustly. And every soul shall be paid back fully what it has done, and He knows best what they do* (39:69-70). The sentence, *He knows best what they do* shows, or hints at, the fact that this paying back fully what every soul has done will be done according to the knowledge of God, and according to His, not their, reckoning.

The sinners have no knowledge and no wisdom. God has deprived them of reason in this world, as He narrates the confession of the people of the Fire: *And they shall say: Had we but listened or pondered [or, understood], we would not have been among the inmates of the burring fire* (67:10). The same will be the case in the hereafter, as God says: *And whoever is blind in this [world], he shall also be blind in the hereafter, and more erring from the way* (17:72); also He says, *It is the fire kindled by Allah, which rises above the hearts* (104:6-7). This deprivation is confirmed in the verse: … *until when they have all come up with one another into it, the last of them shall say with regard to the foremost of them: Our Lord! these led us astray, therefore, give them a double chastisement of the fire. He will say: Every one shall have double but you do not know* (7:38). This verse proves that both the leaders and the followers shall be given double punishment—the leaders, because they went astray and misled others into error; and the followers, because they went astray and kept the path of error open by walking in it. Then the verse says that they do not know.

Question: These verses, which say that the sinners are deprived of knowledge in this world as well as in the hereafter, contradict other verses which say that they do possess knowledge. For example, God says: *A book of which the verses are made plain, an Arabic Qur'an for people who know*

(41:3). Add to it the verses which offer arguments against them. How can one argue with someone who has no knowledge and cannot understand reasoning? Moreover, these verses themselves contain a sort of argument against them in the hereafter. All these things compel us to believe that sinners will possess knowledge and reason in the hereafter.

Apart from this, there are some verses which specifically say that they will possess knowledge and certainty in the hereafter. For example: *Certainly you were heedless of it, but now We have removed from you your veil, so your sight today is sharp* (50:22); *And could you but see when the guilty shall hang down their heads before their Lord! Our Lord! We saw and we heard, therefore send us back, so that we may do good; surely [now] we are certain* (32:12).

Answer: When it is said that sinners have no knowledge in this world, it means that they do not act according to their knowledge. And when it is said that they shall have no knowledge in the hereafter, it means that they cannot escape from the effects of the foolish acts which they have done in this world, and that foolishness will continue to torment them in the hereafter. For example: *And We have made every man's actions to cling to his neck, and We will bring forth to him on the resurrection day a book which he will find wide open* (17:13); *Until when he comes to Us, he says [to Satan]: O would that between me and thee there were the distance of the east and the west …* (43:38). There are many verses which support this interpretation, and we shall explain this matter fully in the commentary of the verse 2:242: *Then Allah makes clear to you His signs so that you may understand.*

Imam al-Ghazālī has explained the matter of the transfer of deeds in a different way in one of his books. The gist of his discourse is as follows:

"The exchange and transfer of good and evil deeds because of injustice and sin is affected in this world as soon as that injustice and sin occurs; but it will be known (only) on the day of resurrection. Then the oppressor will find his good deeds in the accounts of the oppressed. But that transfer had already been effected in this life. Then God will say on that day, *To whom belongs the kingdom this day? To Allah, the One, the Subduer [of all]* (40:16). Thus God will declare in the hereafter that the kingdom belongs to Him. But that kingdom will not come to Him on that day; it is His always and will remain His forever, although this reality will not manifest itself to His creatures before the day of resurrection. And what a man does not

know is for him non-existent, even if in reality it exists; when he comes to know of it, it is as though it came into existence just then.

"Some people say that 'action' is an immaterial, incorporeal thing. It is not a substance which could be transferred from one person to another in this life. And it is equally impossible to transfer it in the hereafter; because after death the action ceases to exist, and a non-existent thing cannot be brought back to existence. Therefore, it is difficult to see how a good or evil deed can be transferred from one person to another, either in this life or in the hereafter.

"But this objection is not correct. When we say that a good deed is transferred, we mean that its reward is transferred. Just as the acts of obedience are done to obtain their reward, so the transfer of the reward, that is, the effect, was metaphorically mentioned as the transfer of the cause, that is, the good deed itself. That reward or effect is not something separate from the human soul; it is a quality ingrained in it. When the soul is brought back in the body, it will return with all its qualities, including the effects of good or evil deeds.

"When a man does a good deed, that is, an act of obedience, a light appears in his heart. In the same way a sin or misdeed causes darkness to appear therein. The light of obedience connects the heart with the sublime world of divine light, knowledge and perception. On the contrary, misdeed and oppression remove the heart away from that world. The effects of good and evil actions are opposed to each other; each tries to weaken or eradicate the other. God has said: *Surely good deeds take away the evil deeds* (11:114). The Prophet has said: 'If you commit any evil deed, follow it up with a good deed, so that it may eradicate it.' Every ill or hurt removes the effects of some sins. That is why the Prophet has said: 'Verily, man is rewarded even for a thorn which pricks his foot.' Also he said: 'The punishments are atonements.'

"When an oppressor oppresses someone, his action creates in his own heart a darkness and hardness which cause the eradication of the effects of the light (that had appeared in his heart because of the previously done good deeds). And his victim feels pain and hurt, and thereby his lust and base feelings are weakened and it causes the obliteration from his heart of the effects of the evil deeds done previously. Darkness gives way to light.

"In this way the light which was in the heart of the oppressor is transferred to the heart of the oppressed; and the darkness in the heart of the

oppressed goes to the heart of the oppressor. This is the meaning of the transfer or exchange of the good and evil deeds.

"It can be said that it is not the real transfer. What it actually means is that the light of the oppressor's heart is extinguished, and a new light is created in the heart of his victim. And the darkness of his victim's heart is removed and a new darkness is created in the heart of the oppressor. And it is not the real interchange.

"The above observation is correct, but the use of this word is still justified. We say: 'The shadow moved from here to there,' or 'The light of the sun or of the lamp moved from the floor to the wall.' Such sentences are quite in order, as they are based on metaphor. And there is a double metaphor in our saying that good deeds are transferred from one man to another. First, the reward of the good deed is called a good deed, using the name of the cause for its effect; then the eradication of a feature at one place and the creation of its like at other place is called the exchange or transfer of the feature. Such figures of speech are common in every language and it could be proved by logical proofs. The evidence from the Qur'an and traditions is in addition to that."

This was the gist of the views expressed by Imam al-Ghazālī. As he himself has said, his explanation reduces this belief to a double metaphor, or a metaphor in metaphor. If we were to extend this interpretation, then all the rules mentioned in this essay would become metaphors. We have written earlier that God has based the system of recompense on social practical wisdom. And there is no doubt that reason treats these laws as a reality, not as a metaphor. Therefore, the system of recompense should also be treated as a reality, not as a metaphor.

This is true so far as this world of practical wisdom is concerned. Of course, if one were to look at the spiritual world, then this whole material world would be seen to be just a metaphor. But here the discussion is not in that context.

Now, we return to the details about deeds:

B) Actions Preserved, Written and Embodied:

Deeds are preserved and written; and assume the form of a body. God has said:

On the day that every soul shall find present what it has done of good, and what it has done of evil, it shall wish that between it and that [evil] there

were a long duration … (3:30); *And We have made every man's actions to cling to his neck, and We will bring forth to him on the resurrection day a book which he will find wide open* (17:13); *… and We write down what they have sent before and their footprints, and We have fully recorded everything in a clear writing* (36:12); *Certainly you were heedless of it, but now We have removed from you your evil, so your sight today is sharp* (50:22).

This subject has already been discussed in the first (Ar.) volume.[1]

C) Relation Between Actions and "Natural" Phenomena:

There is a relation between actions and happenings outside. By "actions" we do not mean here physical movements; what we mean is good and evil deeds. God says: *And whatever affliction befalls you, it is on account of what your hands have wrought, and [yet] He pardons most [of your faults]* (42:30); *Surely Allah does not change the condition of a people until they change their own condition; and when Allah intends evil to a people, there is no averting it* (13:11); *This is because Allah was never to change a favor which He has conferred upon a people until they change their own condition …* (8:53).

These verses clearly show that there is a relation between our actions and the happenings around us, whether good or bad.

This matter is concisely put in two Qur'anic verses: *And if the people of the town had believed and guarded [against evil], We would certainly have opened up for them blessings from the heaven and the earth; but they rejected, so We overtook them for what they had earned* (7:96); *Mischief has appeared in the land and the sea on account of what the hands of men have wrought, that He may make them taste a part of that which they have done, so that they may return* (30:41).

Obviously, natural phenomena are somehow related to human deeds. If humanity remains obedient to the commandments of God and walks on His chosen path, happiness and goodness follow and the doors of bliss are opened. On the other hand if he strays from the path of obedience and continues in his error, mischief and bad faith, chaos appears in the land and on the sea, nations are destroyed because of the injustice prevalent in them, the state of law and order deteriorates, conflict and war become the norm of the day; in short, happiness becomes a scarce commodity

1 See Eng. vol. 2 (Ed.)

and unhappiness reigns in the land. Not only this; natural calamities and disasters appear, like flood, earthquakes, lightening, cyclones, and so on. God has mentioned the deluge of the dam of Maʾārib, the flood of Noah, the lightening of Thamūd and the gale of ʿĀd as some examples of phenomenon.

When a wicked nation is submerged in depravity, vice and evil, God makes it taste the bad consequences of its misdeeds, and this leads to its decline, fall and destruction. God says: *Have they not travelled in the earth and seen how was the end of those who were before them? Mightier than these were they in strength and in fortifications in the land, but Allah destroyed them for their sins; and there was not for them any defender against Allah* (40:21); *And when We wish to destroy a town, We send our Commandment to the people of it who lead easy lives; thus the word proves true against it, so We destroy it with utter destruction* (17:16); *Then We sent Our messengers one after another; whenever there came to a people their messengers, they called him a liar; so We made some of them follow others and We made them stories; so away with a people who do not believe* (23:44).

So this is the story of evil people. Diametrically opposed to it is the story of good and virtuous nations.

Individuals, like groups and nations, are taken over by the effects of their good and evil deeds, by calamities and misfortunes. In addition to this, an individual is sometimes blessed with the blessings given to his forefathers, and is also sometimes overtaken by the results of his ancestors' misdeeds and oppression. God quotes Jacob as saying to Joseph: *And thus will your Lord choose you and teach you the interpretation of sayings and make His favor complete to you and to the children of Jacob as He made it complete before to your fathers, Abraham and Isaac …* (12:6). The favors mentioned in this verse refer to the kingdom, honor, etc. which God gave to Joseph.

Thus We made the earth to swallow up him and his abode … (28:81); *… and We assigned to him a lofty tongue of truthfulness* (19:50); *Probably this lofty tongue of truthfulness means good and righteous offspring, as Allah says in another place; And He made it a word to continue in his posterity …* (43:28); *And as for the wall, it belonged to two orphan boys in the city, and there was beneath it a treasure belonging to them, and their father was a righteous man; so your Lord desired that they should attain their maturity and take out their treasure …* (18:82); *And let those fear who, should*

they leave behind weakly offspring, would fear on their account … (4:9). It hints that the offspring may be overtaken by the effects of the injustice of their forefathers.

When God bestows a bounty on a nation (or an individual), and that nation (or individual) is righteous, then that bounty is a blessing—and at the same time a trial to test its (or his) faith. God says about Solomon that: he said: *This is of the grace of my Lord that He may try me whether I am grateful or ungrateful; and whoever is grateful, he is grateful only for his own self, and whoever is ungrateful, then surely my Lord is Self-sufficient, Honored* (27:40). Again God says: *If you are grateful, I would certainly give you more, and if you are ungrateful, My chastisement is truly severe* (14:7). These two verses prove that thankfullness to God is in itself a good deed which brings about the blessings of God.

If that blessed nation (or individual) is unrighteous and wicked then that blessing is a devise of God to lead it step by step to its ruin, or a respite given to it to complete the proof of God against it. God says: *… and they devise plans and Allah too arranges a plan; and Allah is the best of planners* (8:30); *We will lead them on by steps from whence they perceive not; and yet I respite them; surely My plan is firm* (68:44-45); *And certainly we tried before them the people of Pharaoh…* (44:17).

And if misfortune comes to a nation (or individual), and trouble and travail plague them, and they are righteous people, then that affliction is a test and trial by which God separates his good servants from the evil ones. They come out of that suffering more purified, like gold when it is melted in the fire. God says: *Do men think that they will be left alone on saying, We believe, and not be tried? And certainly We tried those before them, so Allah will certainly know those who are true and He will certainly know the liars. Or do they who work evil think that they will escape Us? Evil is it that they judge!* (29:2-4); *… and We bring these days to men by turns, and that Allah may know those who believe and take witness from among you …* (3:140).

And if the people undergoing hardship are wicked, then that hardship is the chastisement of their misdeeds and a sign of the wrath of God. Earlier-mentioned verses are enough to show this aspect.

So this is the story of actions which happen in the world and ultimately returns to their doer.

It is necessary to mention here that the following verses has no

connection with the subject under discussion: *And were it not that all people would have been of one way of life, We would certainly have assigned to those who disbelieve in the Beneficent God [to make] of silver the roofs of their houses and the stairs by which they ascend, and the doors of their houses and the couches on which they recline; and [other] embellishments of gold; and all this is naught but provision of this world's life, and the hereafter is with your Lord only for those who guard [against evil]* (43:33-35).

The purpose of these verses is to condemn this world and its paraphernalia, and to show that it has no value or importance in the eyes of God, and that is why He bestows it even on the disbelievers. And had it not been misleading to the people, He would have reserved all the ease and comfort of this world for the disbelievers.

Question: Calamities, whether common to all or particular to a group or an individual, like floods, earthquakes, epidemics, wars, famines, and so on occur because of their well-known physical or natural causes. When the causes appear, the results follow; and makes no difference whether the nation or individual is good or wicked. Therefore, there is no reason to say that such phenomena occur because of good or evil deeds. Such a claim is just a theory invented by religion which is not supported by facts or experience.

Answer: We will discuss this philosophical question in detail in the commentary of the verse 7:96, *And if the people of the towns had believed and guarded [against evil], We would certainly have opened up for them blessings from the heaven and the earth.*[1]

But a short reply is appended below:

This objection arises because the meaning of the discourse of the Qur'an is not understood properly. When the people of the Qur'an say that good or bad actions bring out similar good or bad happenings in the world, they do not mean that there are no natural or physical causes for those happenings, or that those causes have lost their effectiveness in such incidents. Also, they do not say that those good or evil deeds are, together with natural causes, joint causes of those happenings. For example, when we say that there is a Creator for this world, we do not mean to negate the system of cause and effect which is found in the universe, nor do we say that these causes are partners with God in the creation of the world.

---

1 See Eng. vol. 15. (Ed.)

What we say is that there is a cause over and above all other apparent causes. Likewise, when we say that good or evil actions result in good or evil incidents in the world, we do not deny the effectiveness of natural causes; we only mean that there is a higher and more powerful cause, that is, the good or evil deeds of human beings which serves as the motive power of the natural causes. When a man writes, it is the pen which draws the letters on the paper; but the pen moves not on its own account but by the movement of the hand; and a man with open eyes will not stop even there—he will see the person who moves his hand. When he talks about that person writing, he does not negate the effect and force of the hand or the pen; but he knows who the real writer is.

Experience and observation have shown that creation has given every species the means to avert damage or deterioration. Why should homo sapiens alone be an exception to this rule? Also every species is confronted by one or more opposing forces to sharpen its own defensive powers, and in this way it continues from strength to strength till it reaches its perfection. Why should man not be provided with this means of reaching the height of his perfection?

God says: *And We did not create the heavens and the earth and what is between them in sport. We did not create them both but with the truth, but most of them do not know* (44:38-39); *And We did not create the heaven and the earth and what is between them in vain; that is the opinion of those who disbelieve …* (38:27). If a maker makes anything without any purpose just in sport, there remains no further relation between him and the thing made; he does not care what happens to that thing. But if he makes it for a purpose, he looks after it; if any snag appears in its proper functioning, he mends and repairs it by adding or subtracting something or by dismantling and re-assembling it. The same is the case with the creation of the heavens and the earth and what is between them, including human beings. God did not create all these in vain or in sport; He created them with a purpose and they have to return to Him, as He has said: *What! Did you then think that We had created you in vain and that you shall not be returned to Us?* (23:115); *And that to your Lord is the end goal* (53:42).

With this background, it is exceedingly clear that God's Providence should be concerned with leading mankind to the goal of its perfection, first by calling them to come to the right path and guiding them to it; then through test and trial; and finally by destroying those about whom

there is no hope at all that they may attain the goal of their creation. It is only in this way that the creative goal of individuals and the whole of the species can be achieved; and damaged, nay, damaging parts can be discarded and thrown into perdition, giving relief and respite to the other parts. God says: *And your Lord is the Self-sufficient One, the Lord of mercy; if He pleases, He may take you off, and make whom He pleases successors of you, even as he raised you up from the seed of another people* (6:133).

(Ponder upon the place and significance of the sentence, *And your Lord is the Self-sufficient One, the Lord of mercy*.)

To make a long story short, this divine system of trial and retribution is, as declared by God, an insuperable, invincible and irresistible force which no one can control or subdue. God says: *And whatever affliction befalls you it is on account of what your hands have wrought, and [yet] He pardons most [of your faults]. And you cannot escape in the earth, and you shall not have a guardian or a helper besides Allah* (42:30-31). Also He says: *And certainly Our word has already gone forth in respect of Our servants, the messengers. Most surely they shall be the assisted ones, and most surely Our host alone shall be the victorious ones* (37:171-173).

D)Actions with Reference to Happiness and Misery:

Those actions causing happiness will always be victorious over those causing misery. Every good quality belongs to actions causing happiness: victory, steadfastness, stability, peace, hope, eternity, and so on. Its opposite factors, destruction, nullity, shakiness, fear, decline and defeat, belong to actions causing misery.

There are numerous Qur'anic verses declaring the above fact. See, for example, the following parable: *Have you not seen how Allah sets forth a parable of a good word [being] like a good tree, whose root is firmly fixed and whose branches are in heaven, yielding its fruit on every moment by the permission of its Lord? And Allah sets forth parables for men that they may reflect. And the parable of an evil word is as an evil tree pulled up from the earth's surface; it has no stability. Allah confirms those who believe with the sure word in this world's life and in the hereafter, and Allah lets the unjust go astray, and Allah does what He pleases* (14:24-27). Also God says: *That He may manifest the truth of what was true and show the falsehood of what was false, even though the guilty ones disliked* (8:8); *… and the [good] end is for guarding [against evil]* (20:132); *And certainly Our word has already*

gone forth in respect of Our servants, the messengers. Most surely they shall be the assisted ones, and most surely Our host alone shall be the victorious ones (37:171-173); *… and Allah is predominant over His affair, but most people do not know* (12:21). There are other similar verses.

The last words of the last mentioned verse, *but most people do not know*, show that this predominance and victory is not as people think, because most of them are unaware of this victory. Had it been material victory which could be perceived by everyone, the majority would not have remained ignorant of it. This ignorance and unawareness results from two factors:

First: The thinking power of man is limited; his eyes see only those things which are near to him; he talks about the present and is unaware of what the future has in store. His kingdom is of this day, and his predominance is of this moment. He measures the whole of existence according to the scale of his short span of life and its small possessions. But God is the Master of time and space and the Ruler of this world as well as the hereafter. He has power and authority over everything. When He judges, He separates the right from the wrong; when He decrees, it is done with truth. This world and the hereafter are but one in His sight; He is not afraid that anything will escape away from His authority. He, therefore, makes no haste in any affair. It is possible (rather, it is a fact) that He may decree a single day's disturbance to establish peace and order for a long time; or the tragedy of one individual as a means of happiness for the whole nation. Now the ignorant man thinks that God was helpless and could not remove that disturbance or tragedy. (How evil is what he thinks!) But, the fact is that God sees the whole chain of time even as He sees a single link of it; He judges about His whole creation as He judges about a single person. One affair does not make him oblivious of another affair; and the preservation of both does not tire Him; and He is the High, the Great. God says: *Let it not deceive you that those who disbelieve go to and fro in the cities [fearlessly]. A brief enjoyment! Then their abode is hell, and evil is the resting place!* (3:195-196).

Second: A spiritual victory is not the same as a material one. A material victory and predominance means that the victor controls the actions of the vanquished, by depriving them of their freedom of choice, and by compelling them to do what they do not like. It is enough to look at colonial and imperial powers: at how they gave themselves licence to kill

and enslave the weaker people and how they ruled on them as it suited their whim and fancy. But experience shows that tyranny and compulsion cannot last long; and, that therefore, a colonial authority cannot rule over its colonies forever—it is but a passing show.

A spiritual victory, on the other hand, depends on capturing hearts and minds; it trains people who believe in the cause and are ready to sacrifice themselves to make the cause succeed. There is no grade above perfect faith, and no fortress stronger than belief. When one believes in a cause it is bound to manifest itself one day, even if, for the present, it remains hidden from the public eye. It is for this reason that the great powers and living societies put such a great emphasis on the dissemination of their views throughout the world. Sometimes, they spend more time and energy on such propaganda than on arms and ammunition. It is because they know that faith in a cause is more powerful than guns and tanks. If this is correct about these illusionary causes of politics, it must be far more correct about the eternal truth to which God invites the mankind.

Nothing stands in opposition to truth, *per se*, except falsehood. And what is there after truth except error and falsehood? It is known that falsehood cannot stand against truth. It is bound to fall, and truth is bound to vanquish error and falsehood.

Truth, in its effectiveness, as well as in its conveyance to the destination, is not inconsistent nor does it fail to bring about its result. If a believer overcomes an enemy of the truth, in this life, then he is the victor and also gets the good reward for it in the hereafter. If, on the other hand, he is defeated by the enemy of the truth, and the enemy compels him to adopt things which are disliked by God, it is his duty to act accordingly and save his life—and God will be pleased with that apparently irreligious behavior. God says: … *except [when] you guard yourselves against [them] for fear from them* (3:28). And if the enemy kills him, then it will be for him an everlasting pleasant life, not death. God says: *And do not speak of those who are slain in Allah's way as dead; nay, [they are] alive, but you do not perceive* (2:154).

In this way, the believer is never vanquished; he is always victorious—either both apparently and in reality, or only in reality. God refers to this aspect in the verse, *Say: Do you await for us but one of the two most excellent things …* (9:52).

The truth, therefore, is always victorious in this world.

Nature, that is, creation, is leading the human species towards truth and felicity—it is leading it creatively—and certainly it will reach its goal. The apparent victory of falsehood which we experience from time to time is not worthy of our attention: these are stepping stones for the truth to reach its height. Why should we worry? 'Time' has yet to come to its end, the world still exists, and the system of creation is still all powerful. There is enough time for truth to overpower falsehood. This much about the victory of truth in appearance. There is no need to explain in so many words about its victory in reality: we all know that the truth is always victorious.

Why did we say in the beginning that every good characteristic, such as permanence, stability and beauty, belongs to the true word and deed; and every evil characteristic, such as instability, infirmity, evil and ugliness, belongs to the false word and deed? We have mentioned previously the following verses: *That is Allah, your Lord, the Creator of every thing; there is no Allah but He; whence are you then turned away?* (40:62); *Who made good everything that He has created …* (32:7); *Whatever benefit comes to you, it is from Allah, and whatever misfortune befalls you, it is from yourself* (6:79). All these verses show that wrongs and evils are "non-existence"; and as such they cannot be attributed to God who is the Creator, Originator and Bestower of existence.

The case of the good is just the opposite. It is, therefore, attributed to God. And it is because of this that good words and good deeds are the source of every beauty and elegance, and the origin of every virtue and felicity (like stability and permanence, blessing and benefit), in contrast to evil words and deeds. God says: *He sends down water from the heavens, then the valleys flow according to their measure, and the torrent bears along the swelling foam; and from what they melt in the fire, for the sake of [making] ornaments or apparatus, arises a scum like it; thus does Allah compare truth and falsehood; then as for the scum, it passes away as a worthless thing; and as for that which profits the people, it remains in the earth; thus does Allah set forth parables* (13:17).[1]

E) Actions with Reference to Reason:

Good words and deeds conform with the dictates of reason, in contrast

1 See the explanation of verse 13:17 in Eng. vol. 5 under the verse 3:7 where the author shows how this verse [13:17] is a mirror of an ambiguous verse. (Ed.)

with the evil words and deeds. It has already been explained that God has made his laws on the foundation of reason. By reason we mean that faculty by which man perceives right and wrong, and distinguishes between good and bad.

It is for this reason that God commanded man to follow his reason, and forbade everything which deranges the reason or throws it into confusion, like drinking alcoholic liquids, gambling, uttering vain words, adultery, cheating, and so on. He also forbade lying, slandering, false accusation, embezzlement, murder, and, in short, all such things which throw reason out of gear and lead it to a wrong judgement. Human life is built on the basis of correct perception and proper thinking, in all its affairs—individual as well as social. If you analyze the personal and collective ills of humanity, you will find that they spring from actions which disturb and confuse the reason. This subject will be explained, God willing, in another place.

Examining Narrations

(1) Ibn Jarīr has narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās that he said: "I was riding (on a camel) behind the Messenger of God. He said: 'O Ibn ʿAbbās! Be satisfied with what God (*qaddara*) has measured (decreed) for you even if it is against your wishes; because it is so written in the Book of God.' I said: 'O Messenger of God! And where is it, and I have read the Qur'an?' He said: *and it may be that you dislike a thing while it is good for you, and it may be that you love a thing while it is evil for you; and Allah knows, while you do not know.*" (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: This tradition implies that *taqdīr* (measure, decree) is a general word, covering both legislation and creation, and that its meaning varies according to the context. But this tradition does not show that *ʿasā* (may be) can be used to mean obligation. it has been explained that this word is used in the Qur'an in its literal meaning, and that is "may be," expectation. Therefore, the opinion expressed by a commentator that wherever the word *ʿasā* has been used in the Qur'an, God's words, "may be" implies compulsion is not worthy of consideration. Even more strange is the view of another that wherever "may-be" comes in the Qur'an it indicates compulsion (obligation) except in two verses, one in the Chapter of al-Taḥrīm (*May be if he divorces you …*), and the other in

the Chapter of al-ʿIsrā (*It may be that your Lord will have mercy on you …*)

(2) There is a tradition narrated by Ibn Jarīr from the chain of al-Suddī: The Messenger of God sent a company consisting of seven of his companions, under the command of ʿAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh al-Asadī. The other members were: ʿAmmār b. Yāsir, Abū Ḥudhayfah b. ʿUtbah b. Rabīʿah, Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ, ʿUtbah b. Ghazwān al-Sulamī (an ally of Banī Nawfal), Sahl b. Bayḍāʾ, ʿĀmir b. Fuhayrah and Wāqid b. ʿAbdullāh al-Yarbūʿī (an ally of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb).

The Prophet wrote a letter and gave it to ʿAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh telling him not to read it until he camped at Malal. When ʿAbdullāh camped at the valley of Malal, he opened the letter. Written in it was: "Proceed till you camp in the valley of Nakhlah." On reading it he told his companions: "Anyone who is ready to die let him proceed (with me) and make his will, because I am making my will and proceeding as ordered by the Messenger of God." So he went on, and only Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and ʿUtbah b. Ghazwān remained behind because they had lost their camel. And ʿAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh went forward, and lo! they unexpectedly met al-Ḥakam b. Kaysān, ʿAbdullāh b. al-Mughīrah b. ʿUthmān and ʿAmr al-Ḥaḍramī. They fought and arrested al-Ḥakam b. Kaysān and ʿAbdullāh b. al-Mughīrah; and al-Mughīrah fled away; and ʿAmr al-Ḥaḍramī was killed by Wāqid b. ʿAbdullāh. And it was the first booty taken by the companions of Muḥammad. When they returned to Medina with the two captives and the booty, the polytheists said: "Muḥammad thinks that he follows the commands of God and he is the first to desecrate the sacred month." Then God sent down the verse: *They ask you concerning the sacred month about fighting in it. Say: Fighting in it is a grave matter; is not allowed.* And what you did, O polytheists! is still graver than killing in the sacred month, because you disbelieved in God, and hindered Muḥammad from God's way; and the mischief, that is polytheism, is graver before God than the killing. And this is the saying of God, and hindering (men) from God's way and denying it …(*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: The traditions giving this and similar meanings are numerous from Sunni chains. And this meaning is also narrated in

Majmaᶜ al-bayān; and some traditions say that the company consisted of eight persons, the ninth being their leader.

(3) Ibn Isḥāq, Ibn Jarīr, Ibn Abī Ḥātim and al-Bayhaqī have narrated from the chain of Yazīd b. Rawmān from ᶜUrwah, that he said: "The Messenger of God sent ᶜAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh to Nakhlah, and told him: 'Stay there until you bring to us some news about (the activities and intentions of) the Quraysh.' And he did not order him to fight. And it was in the sacred month. And he (that is, the Messenger of God) wrote for him a letter before informing him about the journey, and told him: 'Go out with your companions; when you have travelled two days, open (this) your letter and look into it and proceed to do what I have ordered you in it. And do not force any of your companions to go with you (against his wishes)' When he travelled for two days, he opened the letter and found in it (the words): 'Proceed further until you camp at Nakhlah, and bring for us whatever information reaches you about the Quraysh.' When he (ᶜAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh) read the order, he told his companions: 'Hearing and obeying! Whoever among you desires martyrdom, should come with me, for I am proceeding on the order of the Messenger of God. And whoever among you dislikes it let him go back, because the Messenger of God has forbidden me to compel anyone of you (against his wishes).' The whole group proceeded with him until they reached Najrān where Saᶜd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and ᶜUtbah b. Ghazwān lost a camel which they rode alternately. They, therefore, remained behind to search for it; and the others went forward till they camped at Nakhlah. Then passed by them ᶜAmr al-Ḥaḍramī, al-Ḥakam b. Kaysān, ᶜUthmān and al-Mughīrah b. ᶜAbdullāh; with them was the merchandise which they had brought from al-Tāʾif: condiments and oil. When they saw them, Wāqid b. ᶜAbdullāh rose high to show himself to them, and he had shaved his head. When they saw him with shaved head, ᶜAmr said: 'No harm will befall you from him.' And the companions of the Messenger of God consulted with one another about the polytheists; and it was the last day of Jumāda al-ukhrā.[1] They thought: if we kill them

1 The sixth month of the Islamic calendar. (Ed.)

it will be in the sacred month, and if we leave them, they will enter Mecca this night and they will be on guard. At last, they all decided to kill them. Wāqid b. ʿAbdullāh al-Tamīmī shot an arrow at ʿAmr al-Ḥaḍramī and killed him. ʿUthmān b. ʿAbdullāh and al-Ḥakam b. Kaysān were captured, and al-Mughīrah ran away and they could not catch him. And they took the caravan and came with it to the Messenger of God. He told them: 'By God! I had not ordered you to fight in the sacred month.' And he kept the matter of the goods and the captives in suspense and did not accept anything from it. When the Messenger of God said to them what he said, they felt ashamed and thought that they had fallen into perdition; and their brethren, the Muslims, upbraided them harshly. When the report of the incident reached the Quraysh, they said: 'Muḥammad spilled unlawful blood, and took property, and arrested men and desecrated the sacred month." Then God sent down the verse: They ask you concerning the sacred month about fighting in it … When it was revealed, the Messenger of God retained the merchandise and freed the two captives on ransom. The Muslims asked: 'O Messenger of God! Do you hope that it will be (counted as) a *jihād* (religious war) for us? Then God revealed the verse: Surely those who believed and those who fled (their home) and strove hard in the way of God these hope for the mercy of God; and God is Forgiving, Merciful. And they were eight people, and the ninth was their leader, ʿAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: There are other traditions showing that this verse: *Surely those who believed … Merciful*, was revealed about the group of ʿAbdullāh b. Jaḥsh.

This verse proves that if someone performs an act of obedience, with the intention of coming nearer to God, but it turns out to be a mistake, not a good deed, then he is not counted as a sinner because he did it inadvertently. Also, the last sentence of the verse, mentioning the forgiveness of God, shows that divine forgiveness covers even those situations where there was no sin or error. Therefore, the use of the word "forgiveness" or its derivatives does not necessarily mean that the recipient of the divine forgiveness had committed a sin.

The traditions imply that "They ask" refers to the Muslims, not the

polytheists who ridiculed the Muslims. This view is supported by the tradition of Ibn ʿAbbās mentioned under the preceding verse: "I did not see any people better than the companions of Muḥammad." They did not ask him except thirteen questions till he was taken away (from this world), all of those questions are in the Qur'an. Among them are: *They ask you about the intoxicants and games of chance*; *They ask you about the sacred month* … Also, the context of the verse supports it, as the words: *and they will go on fighting with you* …, are addressed to the believers.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verses 219-220

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْخَمْرِ وَالْمَيْسِرِ ۖ قُلْ فِيهِمَا إِثْمٌ كَبِيرٌ وَمَنَافِعُ لِلنَّاسِ وَإِثْمُهُمَا
أَكْبَرُ مِنْ نَفْعِهِمَا ۗ وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ مَاذَا يُنْفِقُونَ قُلِ الْعَفْوَ ۗ كَذَٰلِكَ يُبَيِّنُ اللَّهُ لَكُمُ
الْآيَاتِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَفَكَّرُونَ ﴿٢١٩﴾ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ ۗ وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْيَتَامَىٰ ۖ قُلْ
إِصْلَاحٌ لَهُمْ خَيْرٌ ۖ وَإِنْ تُخَالِطُوهُمْ فَإِخْوَانُكُمْ ۚ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ الْمُفْسِدَ مِنَ الْمُصْلِحِ ۚ
وَلَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَأَعْنَتَكُمْ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزِيزٌ حَكِيمٌ ﴿٢٢٠﴾

(2:219-220) ***They ask you about intoxicants and games of chance, Say: In both of them there is a great sin and [some] profit for men, and their sin is greater than their profit. And they ask you as to what they should spend. Say: Whatever can be spared. Thus does Allah make clear to you the signs, that you may ponder. About this world and the hereafter. And they ask you concerning the orphans. Say: To set right for them [their affairs] is good; and if you mingle with them, they are your brethren; and Allah knows the mischief maker from the well-doer; and if Allah had willed, He would certainly have made it hard for you; surely Allah is Mighty, Wise.***

Commentary

They ask you about intoxicants and games of chance: According to the language, intoxicant (*khamr*) is every liquid which is made to intoxicate. The root word, *khamr* means "to hide." The liquor is called *khamr* because it hides reason and does not allow it to discriminate between right and wrong, between good and bad.

From the same root is derived *khimār* that is, the veil which covers the head of a woman. *Khammartu al-ʾināʾ* means "I covered the opening of the pot." When yeast is added to dough, they say *ikhmarrati al-ʿajīn*. And the yeast itself is called *khamīrah*, because when it is mixed with flour, it covers the flour when it rises and ferments.

The Arabs did not know any alcoholic beverages except those made

from grapes, dates and barley. Gradually, new kinds were invented and now its types and kinds are innumerable, with varying grades of intoxication. But all are intoxicant (*khamr*). *Maysir*, according to the language, is gambling. The gambler is called *yāsir*.

The root word, *yusr* means ease. Gambling was called *maysir* because by it one might get wealth with ease without going to the trouble of earning and working.

The word *maysir* was mostly used for a particular method of gambling with arrows. It was also called *azlām* and *aqlām*. It was played by ten persons in the following manner:

A camel was purchased, slaughtered and divided into twenty four parts. There were ten arrows: each had a separate name and its specified share. Their names (with their shares in brackets) are given hereunder:

Fadhdh (1); *tawʾam* (2); *raqīb* (3); *hils* (4); *nāfis* (5); *musbil* (6); *muʿallā* (7). The remaining three arrows drawn with the names of the participants; anyone on whose name one of the first seven arrows was drawn took the number of the shares allotted to it; those on whose names the last-named three arrows were drawn got nothing and had to pay the price of the camel.

Say: In both of them there is a great sin and [some] profit for men, and their sin is greater than their profit: Sin (*ithm*) is near to evil (*dhanb*) in meaning. It means a condition in the thing or in reason which prevents the man from getting the good. In other words, *ithm* is that evil which brings unhappiness and failure even in other affairs, and disturbs the felicity of life even in other matters.

Clearly, alcoholic drinks and games of chance fit this description.

The health hazards of alcohol have been described in untold numbers of books written by ancient and modern physicians, in which they have listed the havoc created by it in the stomach, the intestines, the liver, the lungs, the nervous system, the veins and arteries, the heart and the organs of perception, that is, the eyes, the tongue, and so on. The data collected by them show the vast magnitude of the damage to the millions and millions of people who are attacked by a variety of diseases caused by this killing poison.

The social and moral disasters appearing in the wake of addiction to drink are too well-known to need any description. Depravity of character, debauchery, shamelessness, the leakage of secrets, scandals, slanders, destruction and damage to others, crimes, murder—name any immorality,

alcohol will lead to it. In short, it nullifies all ethical laws and moral values upon which are based the felicity and bliss of this life and, more particularly, the values of chastity and probity. Who can protect society from a drunkard who does not understand what he says and does not know what he does. Look at the crimes which have wrecked havoc throughout the world and have made human life a misery; search for their causes, and behind almost all of them you will see the hand of alcohol, directly or indirectly manipulating the minds of the criminals.

Nobody can deny the damage inflicted by alcohol upon the mind. Is there any need to describe how it negates the reason, puts the thinking process out of equilibrium and distorts the feelings and perceptions, not only during intoxication, but even afterwards. This damage to the whole system of perception and reason is the biggest sin and disaster of alcohol, from which sprout all other sins and disasters.

Islam, as described earlier, has based its laws on true reason, and has most emphatically forbidden all such actions which hinder the proper functioning of reason. Intoxicants, games of chance, adultery, falsehood and other such sins come in this category. The activities which are most damaging to the faculty of reason are drinking alcohol (among the deeds) and speaking lies (among the words).

These activities which nullify the rule of reason, and especially the politics which is based on alcohol and lies, endanger humanity, and destroy the foundation of happiness. Whenever such a policy bears a fruit, it proves far more bitter than the previous one. When a burden proves unbearable, they add on some more weight and hope that the practice will make the bearer perfect, and would give him more strength! Such endeavours result in failure; such activities end in loss. This one characteristic of Islam—that it has based its shariah on reason and has prohibited all such things which damage it—is enough to place it at the top of all the systems invented by human beings throughout the world.

Human beings, because of their animal tendencies, eagerly run towards the satisfaction of their lust. Lustful activities easily contaminate the environment, in contrast to chastity and piety. It is easy to acquire a bad habit and very difficult to leave it. That is why God legislated such laws gradually, and led people to the ultimate goal step by step and sympathetically. One of those widely-spread evils was the drinking of alcohol. And a cursory glance at the four verses revealed about the subject will show

how, by easy stages, they were weaned from this bad habit.

First, God revealed, Say: *My Lord has only prohibited indecencies, those of them that are apparent as well as those that are concealed, and sin and rebellion without justice, and that you associate with Allah that for which He has not sent down any authority, and that you say against Allah what you do not know* (7:33).

This verse was revealed in Mecca, and it has clearly forbidden the sin (*ḥarrama*). Now we know that there is sin—great sin even—in alcohol, although at that time God did not clarify what sin was. This ambiguity was, perhaps, a sort of compassion; it was as though the shariah wanted to overlook that sin of theirs for the time being. The same is the reason for the indirect hint in another verse of the same Meccan period: *And of the fruits of the palms and the grapes—you obtain from them intoxication and goodly provision* (16:67). It separated intoxication from "goodly provision" but stopped short of declaring it as a "bad provision."

Apparently people were not aware that intoxication was a great sin, until the verse was revealed: *O you who believe! Do not go near prayer when you are intoxicated until you know [well] what you say …* (4:43)

This verse was revealed at Medina, and it promulgated the partial prohibition of liquor in the best of the times and the best of the places—at the time of prayer in the mosque.

Reason and the context of the verse shows that this verse could not have been revealed after the verses of the Chapters of al-Baqarah and al-Māʾidah (which will be described shortly), because those verses promulgate total prohibition. There was no reason why a partial ban should be imposed after a total prohibition. Also, we know that this prohibition was promulgated gradually, and such a case demands proceeding from an easier step to a more difficult one, and not vice versa.

Then came the verse under discussion. It says that there is in intoxicants and games of chance a great sin and (some) profit for men, and their sin is greater than their profit.

This verse, revealed after the above-mentioned verse 4:43, promulgates total prohibition of intoxicants and games of chance. It clearly says that "there is great sin" in these two evils. And verse 7:33, mentioned in the beginning, revealed at Mecca, had clearly prohibited sin.

This explanation exposes the absurdity of a commentator who says that this verse was not clear about the prohibition of liquor. First, let us

give you a gist of what he says:

> "This verse of the Chapter of al-Baqarah was not clear about the prohibition of alcohol and gambling; the words of God that there is great sin in them only show that these are sinful acts, and sin means harm. Even if we say that every harmful thing is prohibited, it does not include those things which are partially harmful and partially beneficial. That is why there was a difference of opinion about alcohol among the companions of the Prophet. Some of them left drinking after the revelation of this verse, while others continued to drink. Perhaps, the drinkers thought that they could easily enjoy its profit safeguarding themselves from its harms. When the ground was thus prepared, God revealed the verse of the Chapter of al-Mā'idah which totally and clearly prohibits these things: *O you believe! Intoxicants and games of chance and [sacrificing to] stones set up and [dividing by] arrows are an abomination of Satan's handiwork; shun it therefore that you may be successful … Will you then desist?* (5:93-94)"

Now let us look critically at the above argument:

First: A major part of this argument rests on the assumption that sin means harm. But it is wrong. Just because in this verse it is followed by the words, and (some) profit for men, it does not imply that its meaning is "harm" or "loss," that is, the opposite of "benefit." How can the word "sin" (*ithm*) be taken to mean "harm" in the verses listed below?

And whoever associates anything with Allah, he devises indeed a great sin (4:48); *And whoever conceals it [that is, testimony], his heart is surely sinful* (2:283); *Surely I wish that you should bear my sin as well as your own sin* (5:29); *Every man of them shall have what he has earned of sin* (24:11); *And whoever earns a sin, he earns it only against his own self* (4:111).

There are many such verses.

Second: The verse did not say that the order was given "because" of the harm inherent in alcohol. It just promulgated the law. There was no justification for the companions to follow their own opinion in this case.

Even if we admit, for the sake of argument, that the verse gives the reason for that order, that reason is not the harm, but the greatness of the harm as compared with the profit. The verse says in clear words, *and their sin is greater than their profit*. Such a clear declaration leaves no room at all for the exercise of one's own opinion. Opinion has no place in the

presence of a clear order of God and the Messenger.

Third: Let us suppose, for the time being, that the verse did not clearly say that liquor and gambling were forbidden. But did it not say in clear words that they were great sins? Was not this verse revealed at Medina? Had not verse 7:33, revealed years ago at Mecca; clearly prohibited the sin? What excuse can be offered by those companions who followed their own opinion. in opposition to these verses of Mecca and Medina, which taken jointly clearly prohibit alcohol and games of chance?

Verse 7:33 prohibits all sins. And this verse under discussion uses the adjective 'great' (*kabīr*) and 'greater' (*akbar*) for the sins of alcohol and gambling. In view of this nobody can remain in any doubt that these two evils are the greatest of all sins; nor can there remain any doubt about their absolute prohibition. The Qur'an has termed murder, the hiding of testimony, lying and slander and so on as "sin," but it has not used the adjective "great" for any sin except polytheism (… *and whoever associates anything with Allah, he devises indeed a great sin.*—4:48) and alcohol and games of chance.

In short, there is no doubt that this verse clearly prohibits these two sins.

Lastly the two verses of the Chapter al-Mā'idah were revealed: *O you who believe! Intoxicants and games of chance and [sacrificing to] stones set up and [dividing by] arrows are only an abomination of Satan's handiwork; shun it therefore that you may be successful. Satan only desires to cause enmity and hatred to spring in your midst by means of intoxicants and games of chance, and to keep you off from the remembrance of Allah and from prayer. Will you then desist?* (5:93-94)

The last sentence (Will you then desist?) shows that the Muslims had not desisted from drinking alcohol even after the revelation of the verse of the Chapter al-Baqarah under discussion; and that there was a need for such a strong admonition.

This much about liquor. So far as gambling is concerned its social evils and the ruin caused by it in the structure of life are well-known, and need no description. But we shall further explain it in the fifth Chapter.

Now we come back to the meaning of the words used in the verse. Sin (*ithm*) has just now been explained. Greatness (*kibr*) in volume is as numerousness (*kathrah*) in number. Their opposite are smallness (*ṣighar*) and paucity (*qillah*) respectively.

These two adjectives are relative ones. When there are two things, one of them may be greater than the other, which then will be called smaller than the first. But the first one which was called "greater" may be smaller than a third one. If there was no comparison, there would be neither the greatness nor the smallness; nor would there by an numerousness or paucity.

Probably people first became aware of greatness when they looked at the size of material things around themselves. Later on they extended this concept to mental visions and ideas. God says: *Surely it [that is, hell] is one of the greatest [misfortunes]* (74:35); *a great* (that is, grievous) *word it is that comes out of their mouths* (18:5); *great* (that is, hard) *to the unbelievers is that which you call them to* (42:13).

ʿIẓam has the same meaning as *kibar*: both denote greatness. Apparently *ʿiẓam* is derived from *ʿaẓm* (bone); as the greatness of the body of an animal or man is related to the size of the skeleton—the bones inside—the word *ʿaẓm* (bone) was metaphorically used for greatness, and gradually "greatness" became its first meaning.

Nafʿ (profit) is opposite of *ḍarar* (harm, loss). These words are used for the things which are desired or disliked because of other things; while good and bad are used for the things which are liked or disliked by themselves.

Profits for men: It refers to the monetary gains as well as the amusement and merry-making for which people indulge in these two sins.

God used here the plural form (profits); but while comparing it with sin He used the singular form (their sin is greater than their profit). As the comparison was in size, and not in number, there was no reason to use the plural which describes the number, not the size.

And they ask you as to what they should spend. Say: Whatever can be spared: *ʿAfw* originally meant 'to go to a thing to get it.' Then, keeping in view various connections and relations, it came to be used for forgiveness, obliteration of footprints and moderation in spending. It is this last meaning which is intended in this verse, and that is why it has been translated as "whatever can be spared."

In this verse, the reply fits the question in the same way as was explained in the verse 2:215, *They ask you to what they should spend. Say: Whatever of good you spend, it is for the parents …*

Thus does Allah make clear to you the signs that you may ponder,

about this world and the hereafter: *Fid-dunyā wa al-ākhirah* literally means "in this world and the hereafter." But it does not mean 'you may ponder while you are in this world and in the hereafter.' It refers to the subject upon which men are expected to ponder. That is why we have translated it "may ponder about this world …"

The verse exhorts the believers to ponder on the realities and affairs of both the worlds. This world is a place which God has created for you to live in and for you to earn in it what might be beneficial to you in your permanent home, that is, the hereafter. That is the place where you will return to your Lord and He will give you the recompense for what you did in this world.

This verse urges people to enquire about, and investigate, the realities of existence, the percepts of the beginning and the end and the mysteries of nature; and to think and ponder upon the social concepts, moral and ethical values, and the laws of life governing individuals and groups. In short, man is expected to think about all the knowledge right from his beginning up to his returning to his Lord, as well as all the affairs coming between these points which have any bearing on the happiness and misery of mankind.

This verse also shows that although the Qur'an demands complete obedience from man towards the command of God and His Messenger, without any if and but, yet it likes people to ponder on those commands and their philosophy so that they may grasp their realities and, instead of blindly following the laws, may see the light of those brilliant teachings and follow that light to ultimate destination.

Thus God does make clear probably means the explanation of the philosophy behind the given laws and commands, and the clarification of the fundamentals of the faith and belief.

And they ask you concerning the orphans. Say: To set right for them [their affairs] is good: There is a hint, a clear indication even, in this verse that it was revealed to lighten some burden—it allows mingling with the orphans, and then goes on to say: *and if Allah had willed, He would certainly have made it hard for you.* It shows that prior to this verse the rules concerning the guardianship of the orphans were hard and difficult, which had caused anxiety and alarm among the Muslims, and which led them to ask the question referred to in the verse.

There were some verses about the orphans, very severe in tone: *And*

give to the orphans their property, and do not substitute worthless [things] for [their] good [ones], and do not devour their property [as an addition] to your own property; this is surely a great crime (4:2); *As for those who swallow the property of the orphans unjustly, surely they only swallow fire into their bellies and soon they shall enter into burning fire* (4:10). Apparently the verse under discussion was revealed after these verses; and the traditions, which will be quoted later, support this view.

The *iṣlāh* (to set right) is used here as a common noun. It denotes, according to the usage of the Arabic language, really good management, not just a show; and the sentence, *and Allah knows the mischief-maker from the well-doer*, points to this.

… ***and if you mingle with them, they are your brethren:*** This sentence refers to the Islamic concept of the equality of all the believers. This concept nullifies all distinctions which are the basic cause of every mischief which appears in society. It abolishes various types of injustice and rebellion; putting oneself on a high pedestal, treating others as one's slaves, thinking of them as an inferior, and weak species. This abolition of differences creates equilibrium in various social weights; there appears a fine balance between a weak orphan and his powerful guardian, between a rich tycoon and a wretched beggar, and so on. God says: *The believers are but brethren* (49:10).

Now, the verse under discussion allows the guardian to mingle with the orphan only when it is done like the mingling of two brothers who have equal obligation towards each other. If something is taken from an orphan's property, then something of equal value must be given to him and added to his property. In this context, this verse runs parallel to the verse mentioned earlier, *And give to the orphans their property, and do not substitute worthless [things] for [their] good [ones], and do not devour their property [as an addition] to your own property; this is surely a great crime* (4:2). A comparison between the two verses shows that the verse under discussion has somewhat lessoned the burden of the guardians; and the sentence, *and Allah knows the mischief-maker from the well-doer*, also hints at this relaxation of rigour. The meaning is: Now you may mingle with your wards, the orphans (and this is the relaxation of the previous rule); but the mingling should be as of two brother who have equal obligations towards each other. If this condition is fulfilled, then there should be no anxiety and fear on your part. If that mingling is with good intentions, and

in order to set their affairs right for them, then it is good; and the reality cannot be hidden from God, and He will not reproach you just because you mingled and mixed with the orphans, provided you did it for their good, like brethren, and God knows the difference between a mischief-maker and a well-doer.

… and Allah knows the mischief maker from the well-doer; and if Allah had willed, He would certainly have made it hard for you; surely Allah is Mighty, Wise: Here the preposition, from (*min*) has been used after "knows" (*yaʿlamu*); probably it is a hint that "knows" in this verse has the significance of "distinguishing"; and the sentence means, "God distinguishes the mischief-maker from the well-doer."

ʿ*Anat* means difficulty and hardship.

Examining Narrations

(1) ʿAlī b. Yaqṭīn said: "al-Mahdī asked Abu al-Ḥasan al-Kāẓim about whether intoxicants were prohibited in the Book of God, because the people know that it is not allowed but do not know that it is prohibited.

"The Imam said: 'But it is prohibited.' He asked: 'Where in the Book of God is it forbidden? O Abu al-Ḥasan!' He replied: 'The word of God: *Say: My Lord has only prohibited indecencies, those of them that are apparent as well as those that are concealed, and sin and rebellion without justice …*' (7:33) Then the Imam explained: 'And as for sin, it is intoxicants themselves, because God said somewhere else, *They ask you about intoxicants and games of chance. Say: In both of them there is a great sin and [some] profits, for men, and their sin is greater than their profits*." So the sin according to the Book of God is intoxicants and games of chance, and their sin is greater than their profit, as God has said.'

"al-Mahdī said: 'O ʿAlī b. Yaqṭīn! This is the legal decree of the house of Hāshim.' I said: 'You spoke the truth, O leader of the faithful! Praise be to God who did not take this knowledge out from you, O people of the house!' "

ʿAlī b. Yaqtīn says: "By God, al-Mahdī could not restrain himself from saying to me, 'You spoke the truth, O Rāfidī!' " (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: The meaning of this tradition can be understood from the commentary.

(2) There is a tradition narrated from Abū Basīr that one of the two imams (that is, fifth or sixth) said: "Verily God made a house for sin, then He made a door for the house, then He made a lock for the door, then He made a key for the lock; and (that) key of sin is intoxicants." (*al-Kāfī*)

(3) There is another tradition from Abū ʿAbdillāh: "The Messenger of God said: 'Verily intoxicants are the head of every sin!' " (*ibid.*)

(4) There is a tradition narrated by Ismāʿīl, in which he said: "Abu Jaʿfar went into the Sacred Mosque; some Qurayshites saw him and said: 'He is the god of the people of Iraq.' Someone said: 'If you send one of you to him.' So a young man from among them came to him and asked: 'O Uncle! What is the greatest of the great (sins)?' He said: 'Drinking alcohol.' " (*ibid.*)

(5) There is a tradition narrated by Abu al-Bilād, that one of the two imams (Imam al-Bāqir or Imam al-Ṣādiq) said: "God has not been disobeyed with anything more powerful than drinking alcohol. Verily one of them leaves the obligatory prayers, and jumps upon his mother and daughter and sister, and he does not know." (*ibid.*)

(6) "An atheist asked Abū ʿAbdillāh: 'Why did God prohibit alcohol when there is nothing more delicious than it?' The Imam said: 'He prohibited it because it is the mother of all wicked things and the head of every evil. There come a time to the drinker, of it when he loses his reason, then he does not know his Lord, and leaves no sin but that he commits it …' " (*al-Iḥtijāj*)

Author's comment: The traditions explain one another and experience and observation support them.

(7) A tradition from Jābir is reported that Abū Jaʿfar said: "The Messenger of God cursed ten persons concerning an alcoholic beverage—the one who plants it, the one who guards it, the one who squeezes its juice out, the one who drinks it, the one who serves it, the one who transports it, the one to whom it is transported, the one who sells it, the one who purchases it, and the one who eats its price." (*al-Kāfī*)

(8) Another tradition says that Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "The Messenger of God said: 'Cursed is he, cursed is he who sits at a table where alcohol is drunk.' " (*ibid.*, *al-Maḥāsin*)

Author's comment: The above two traditions are confirmed by the

words of God, *and do not help one another in sin and transgression* (5:3).

(9) al-Ṣadūq reports through his chains, from Abū Amāmah that he said: "The Messenger of God said: 'There are four persons at whom God will not look (with mercy) on the day of resurrection—the one who is disobedient (to his parents), the one who helps a man and then reminds him of it, the one who denies the destiny (decreed by God), and the one who habitually drinks alcohol.' " (*al-Khiṣāl*)

(10) Ibnu al-Shaykh has reported in *al-Amālī*, through his chains, from Imam al-Ṣādiq that the Prophet said: "My Lord, Great is His Glory! has sworn thus: No servant of mine will drink alcohol in this world but that I shall make him drink on the day of resurrection from the boiling water (of hell) as much as he had drunk alcohol; (it would make no difference) whether after that he is punished or forgiven." The Prophet said: "Verily the one who drinks alcohol shall come on the day of resurrection, with blackened face, blue eyes, a slanting jaw-bone and running saliva, licking his tongue from his back-side."

(11) Abū Jaʿfar said: "It is an obligation upon God (that is, God has made it incumbent upon Himself) that He will make the drinker of alcohol drink what comes out from the vulva of fornicating women. From that vulva will come out pus and thick blood, its heat and stink will offend (even) the inmates of the fire." (*al-Tafsīr*, al-Qummī)

Author's comment: These traditions may be supported by the word of God, *Surely the tree of Zaqqūm is the food of the sinful, like molten brass; it shall boil in [their] bellies, like the boiling of hot water. Seize him, then drag him down into the midst of Hell; then pour over his head of the torment of the boiling water: 'Taste [it]; you forsooth are the mighty, the honorable!* (44:43-49)

There are numerous traditions with the same meaning as described above.

(12) There is a tradition narrated by al-Washshāʾ that he heard Abu al-Ḥasan saying: "Maysir is gambling." (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: Traditions giving this explanation are numerous; and there is no doubt whatsoever about the meaning.

(13) It is reported, under the verse, *And they ask you as to what they*

should spend …, that Ibn ʿAbbās said: "Verily, some people from the companions, when they were told to spend in the way of God, came to the Prophet and said: 'We do not know what this "spending" is which we have been ordered in our properties. So, what should we spend from it?' Then God revealed: and they ask you as to what they should spend. Say: 'Whatever can be spared' And before that, one used to spend his wealth until he no longer had anything left to give in alms, and until there remained no property to eat from." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(14) It is narrated from Yaḥyā that he was told that Maʿādh b. Jabal and Ṭhaʿlabah came to the Messenger of God and said: "O Messenger of God! Verily we have our servants and families; what, therefore, should we spend from our properties?" Then God revealed: *And they ask you as to what they should spend. Say: 'Whatever can be spared'* " (*ibid.*)

(15) It is reported that Imam al-Ṣādiq said about the word *ʿafw*; which we have translated as "whatever can be spared" that *ʿafw* is the middle (course). (*ibid.*, al-ʿAyyāshī)

(16) And it is written that Imam al-Bāqir and Imam al-Ṣādiq said that it is modicum, a sufficiency. And the tradition of Abū Basīr interprets it as frugality, thrift. (al-ʿAyyāshī)

(17) It is reported from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the verse: *And they who when they spend, are neither extravagant nor parsimonious, and [keep] between these the just mean* (25:67) that he said: "This (stage) is after this stage; it is the middle." (*ibid.*)

(18) Imam al-Bāqir said: " *ʿafw* is what is in excess of the maintenance of the year." (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: The tradition express the same meanings in different words; and the last one gives an example of *ʿafw*,

There are innumerable traditions showing the excellence of alms, its ways, place and quantity; some of which shall be quoted in the relevant places, God willing.

(19) There is a tradition from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the verse: *And they ask you concerning the orphans …* that he said: "When the verse: (As for) those who swallow the property of the orphans unjustly, surely they only swallow fire into their bellies and soon they shall enter burning fire, everyone who had any orphan with him turned

him out; and they asked the Messenger of God about turning them out. Then God revealed: And they ask you concerning the orphans. Say: ' To set right for them (their affairs) is good; and if you mingle with them, they are your brethren; and God knows the mischief-maker from the well-doer …' " (*al-Tafsīr*, al-Qummī)

(20) There is a tradition from Ibn ʿAbbās that he said: When God revealed: *And do not approach the property of the orphan except in the best manner …* (6:153) and those who swallow the property of the orphans unjustly …, every one who had an orphan with him went (to his home) and separated his (orphan's) food from his own food and his drink from his own drink; and he put some extra portion in the orphan's food, and kept it reserved for him till he ate it or it deteriorated and he threw it away. This system proved very hard for them, so they mentioned it to the Messenger of God. Then God revealed: *And they ask you concerning the orphans … and if you mingle with them, they are your brethren…* Then they mixed their food with their own food and their drink with their own drink. (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

Author's comment: The same thing has been narrated from Saʿīd b. Jubayr, ʿAṭāʾ and Qatādah.

almizan.org

Verse 221

وَلَا تَنْكِحُوا الْمُشْرِكَاتِ حَتَّىٰ يُؤْمِنَّ ۚ وَلَأَمَةٌ مُؤْمِنَةٌ خَيْرٌ مِنْ مُشْرِكَةٍ وَلَوْ
أَعْجَبَتْكُمْ ۗ وَلَا تُنْكِحُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ حَتَّىٰ يُؤْمِنُوا ۚ وَلَعَبْدٌ مُؤْمِنٌ خَيْرٌ مِنْ مُشْرِكٍ
وَلَوْ أَعْجَبَكُمْ ۗ أُولَٰئِكَ يَدْعُونَ إِلَى النَّارِ ۖ وَاللَّهُ يَدْعُو إِلَى الْجَنَّةِ وَالْمَغْفِرَةِ بِإِذْنِهِ ۖ
وَيُبَيِّنُ آيَاتِهِ لِلنَّاسِ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَذَكَّرُونَ ﴿٢٢١﴾

(2:221) ***And do not marry the idolatresses until they believe; and certainly a believing bonds woman is better than an idolatress, even though she should allure you; and do not give [believing women] in marriage to idolaters until they believe; and certainly a believing bondsman is better than an idolater, even though he should allure you; those invite to the fire, and Allah invites to the garden and to forgiveness by His leave; and makes clear His signs for men, so that they may be mindful.***

Commentary

And do not marry the idolatresses until they believe: al-Rāghib has said in al-Mufradāt:

> The original meaning of *nikāḥ* is *ʿaqd* (the marriage-tie) then it was metaphorically used for sexual intercourse. It is impossible that it could be the other way round, because all the words denoting sexual intercourse are but metaphors; they thought it indecent to mention it, just as they disliked to declare the act itself. It is not possible, for one who does not intend to utter an obscenity, to use the name of an unmentionable act for a decent thing like marriage.

This observation of al-Rāghib is very good; but for this reasoning to be valid, the word *ʿaqd* should be taken to mean the marriage-tie, not the formulae of the proposal and acceptance of marriage. The *mushrikāt* (idolatresses) is the *ism al-fāʿil* (active participle, that is, the noun derived from an infinitive verb denoting its doer) of the verb *ishrāk* which means

"to ascribe a partner to God"; it is also called polytheism. It is well-known that polytheism may be open or hidden, and these two qualities may be of various degrees and grades. The same is the case with belief and disbelief.

The most open kind of polytheism is to believe that there is more than one god and to take and worship idols and treat them as intercessors before God. Less open is the polytheism of the people of the book, as they deny the prophethood of Muḥammad, and, especially their belief that ʿUzayr (Ezra) was the son of God, or Jesus was the son of God, and so is their claim that they themselves are sons of God, and His beloved. All this is polytheism, but less manifest than that of the idolaters. More hidden than that is believing that apparent causes independently create their effects; and then relying on these causes.

The most hidden polytheism is the one from which only the chosen servants of God, with pure hearts, can escape. And that is to be forgetful of God and to divert attention to other than Him.

But there is an important point which must be cleared here. Attributing a verb, adjective or active participle (in its literal sense) to someone is one thing; but using that adjective or active participle as a nomenclature is an entirely different matter. If a believer neglected an obligatory act, it might be said that he denied it or disbelieved in it; but the nomenclature, unbeliever/disbeliever, cannot be used for him. God says: *and for the sake of Allah, pilgrimage to the House is incumbent upon men [upon] everyone who can afford the journey to it; and whoever disbelieves, then surely Allah is Self-sufficient, independent of the worlds* (3:97). Here the verb, "disbelieves," has been used for him who neglects the pilgrimage, still he is not called an "unbeliever," he is a sinner; and if the adjective "unbeliever" or "disbeliever" is used for him at all, it must be conditional, for example "disbeliever in pilgrimage."

The same is the case with all active participles and adjectives used in the Qur'an, like righteous, thankful, purified; and like sinner, unjust, and so on. These terms cannot be used as a nomenclature in every place where the verb, adjective or active participle is used.

Accordingly, we cannot use the nomenclature, polytheist, for all those who indulge in hidden or open polytheism. "Idolater" or "polytheist" is a Qur'anic terminology and we should look at the Qur'an to know who is called a polytheist. The Qur'an does not use this term for the Jews or the Christians. Instead it invented for them a new term, "people of the book."

And the term "disbeliever" (*kāfir*) is general, covering all those who are outside the fold of Islam.

So far as the term, polytheist or idolater, is concerned, the Qur'an uses it in a context where it is known that the disbelievers, other than the people of the book, are meant. See, for example, the following verse: *Those who disbelieved from among the people of the book and the polytheists could not have separated themselves [from the faithful] until there had come to them the clear evidence* (98:1); *… the idolaters are nothing but unclean, so they shall not approach the Sacred Mosque after this year …* (9:28); *then slay the idolaters wherever you find them* (9:5); *How can there be an agreement for the idolaters with Allah and with His Messenger?* (9:7); *… and fight the polytheists all together as they fight you all together …* (9:36) and so on.

Now we come to the verse: *And they said: Be Jews or Christians, you will be rightly guided. Say: Nay! [We follow] the religion of Abraham, the upright one, and he was not one of the polytheists* (2:135). The last sentence, "he was not one of the polytheists," is not an innuendo against the Jews and the Christians. To know its meaning, let us look at another verse: *Abraham was not a Jew, nor a Christian; but he was an upright [man], a Muslim, and he was not one of the polytheists* (3:67). The word "upright (man)" is an adverse allusion to the Jews and the Christians; it exalts Abraham above the soulless ritualism of the Jews as well as the dogmatism of the Christians, the materialism of the one and the misguided spiritualism of the other. It says that Abraham was on the middle path, neither a Jew nor a Christian. And then it uses the word "a Muslim," and shows that he was purely a Muslim, not ascribing any partner, associate or colleague to God; and then it adversely alludes to the polytheists by the words, "he was not one of the polytheists." Likewise, in verse 2:135, the word "the upright one" indirectly hints against the Jews and the Christians who had gone astray; and the sentence, "and he was not one of the polytheists" alludes to the idol-worshippers.

In short, this verse does not refer to the Jews and the Christians as polytheists.

Now we come to some verses where the active participle, polytheist (*mushrik*) has been used for other than idol-worshippers: *And most of them do not believe in Allah without associating other [with Him]* (12:106); *… and woe to the polytheists who do not give zakāt, and they are unbelievers in the hereafter* (41:6-7); *His [Satan's] power is only over those who befriend*

almizan.org

him and those who associate others with Him [Allah] (16:100).

These verses have used the active participle, "polytheists," for those who, for example, befriend Satan and are under his power. Obviously, almost all the believers (except an infinitesimal minority who are friends of God, and are His truly righteous servants) would come under this definition. But we would not be justified in giving them the name, "polytheists" because the active participle and the nomenclature are two different things.

This lengthy explanation shows that the apparent meaning of the verse under discussion prohibits marriage with idol-worshipping men and women only; marriage with the people of the book is not included in this verse.

In this context, there are no grounds at all for saying that this verse abrogated verse 6 of the Chapter of al-Mā'idah; *This day have been made lawful for you [all] good things; and the food of those who were given the book is lawful to you and your food lawful for them; and the chaste [ones] from the believing women and the chaste [ones] from those who were given the book before you [are lawful for you] when you have given them their wage [dower] with chaste intention, not fornicating nor taking them for paramours in secret …* (5:5) Nor is there any reason for saying that this verse (2:221) joined with the verse, *… and hold not to the ties of marriage of unbelieving women …* (60:10), abrogates verse 5:5. Nor is it correct to say that the verse 5:5 has abrogated the two verses, 2:221 and 60:10.

Why are the above opinions wrong? It is because:

First: As explained above, the verse under discussion apparently says nothing about marriage with the people of the book, while the verse of the Chapter of al-Mā'idah (5:5) is concerned only with marriage with the people of the book. As the subject matters of the two verses are totally different, there is no question of one of them abrogating the other.

So far as verse 60:10 is concerned, it speaks about not holding ties of marriage with unbelieving women, and at the first glance it appears contradictory to verse 5:5 which allows marriage with chaste women of the people of the book. But a little more thinking will show (as will be explained later on) that this speaks about a man who accepts Islam and his wife remains a disbeliever, then he is forbidden to hold intact the marriage-tie with that woman, while the verse 5:5 speaks about performing a new marriage with a woman who is from the people of the book. The subject matters, therefore, of the two verses are not the same. Accordingly there

arises no question of abrogation at all.

Second: Even if we accept for the time being that verses 2:221 and 60:10 forbid marriage with a Jewess or a Christian woman, the context compels us to believe that they cannot abrogate verse 5:5 which allows that marriage. Verse 5:5 shows some relaxation of the rule and God describes it as His grace upon the believers. Such a verse cannot be abrogated. In Islam relaxed rules usually get the upper hand over strict ones. Therefore, if there were any abrogation, verse 5:5 would abrogate verses 2:221 and 60:10, and not vice versa.

Third: The Chapter of al-Baqarah (ch. 2) was the first one revealed at Medina soon after Hijrah; and the Chapter of al-Mumtaḥanah (ch. 60) was revealed at Medina before the take-over of Mecca in 8 A.H.: while the Chapter of al-Mā'idah (ch. 5) was the last one revealed—it abrogated some previous rules but no rule revealed in it was ever abrogated.

How could the verses revealed before the Chapter 5 abrogate the verse of that chapter which was yet to be revealed?

… and certainly a believing bondswoman is better than an idolatress, even though she should allure you: The people at that time accorded no dignity to slave-girls and anyone marrying such a woman immediately became an object of scorn. This verse, by qualifying the word "bondswoman" with the adjective "believing" and leaving the word "idolatress" without any condition, emphasizes the principle that a believing woman, even if she is a slave, is better than an idolatress even if she comes from a noble family and is rich and beautiful—the factors which usually attract a man towards a woman.

Someone has said that the word "bondswoman" (*amah*) here and the word "bondsman" (*'abd*) in the next sentence, mean slave woman and slave man of God—in other words, believing woman and believing man. But this interpretation is farfetched.

… and certainly a believing bondsman is better than an idolater, even though he should allure you: The same comment as above.

Those invite to the fire, and Allah invites to the garden and to forgiveness by His leave: It explains the reason why marriage with idol-worshippers has been prohibited. The idolaters believe in falsehood, walk on the wrong path, and, thus, evil characteristics become firmly rooted in their psychology. Disbelief and sin look attractive to them and their eyes lose the ability to see the light of truth. As a result, their whole life becomes

an open invitation to follow them to eternal perdition. In short, by their actions and talks they try to allure and entice the believers to the fire of hell.

The believers, on the other hand, proceed on the path of true faith, and live a righteous and virtuous life; and by their good example in words and deeds invite people to the paradise and the Lord's forgiveness by His leave, as He allowed them to call the people into the right path, leading them to eternal bliss—paradise and forgiveness.

Apparently, it would have looked proper to say, "and these (that is, the believers) invite to the paradise…," as the contrasting sentence says: "those invite to the fire." But God used His own name instead of the believers to show that the believers in this invitation, nay, in all their activities and affairs, rely on their Creator and Lord; they are not independent of God, their Master. God says: … *and Allah is the Master of the believers* (3:68).

This sentence may be interpreted also in another way: The invitation to the garden and to forgiveness may be a reference to this law itself—the rule forbidding marriage with polytheists is in itself an invitation to paradise and the forgiveness of God.

almizan.org

Examining Narrations

(1) It is written about this verse that it was revealed about Marthad b. Abī Marthad al-Ghanawī. The Messenger of God sent him to Mecca to bring some Muslims out; and he was a strong and brave man. A woman, ʿUnāq by name, offered him her person, but he refused; they had been friends before the advent of Islam. Then she said: "Well, will you then agree to marry me?" He said: "Not before I seek permission from the Messenger of God" When he returned (to Medina), he asked permission to marry her. (*Majmaʿ al-bayān*)

Author's comment: The same thing has been narrated in *al-Durr al-manthūr* from Ibn ʿAbbās.

(2) al-Wāḥidī has narrated through the chain of al-Suddī from Abū Mālik from Ibn ʿAbbās about this verse that it was revealed about ʿAbdullāh b. Rawāḥah. He had a black slave-girl; once he became angry and slapped her (on the face). Then he felt frightened, and coming to the Prophet told him the story. The Prophet said: "What is she? O ʿAbdullāh!" He replied: "She keeps the fast, prays,

does *wuḍū* properly, and offers testimony that there is no god except God and that you are His Messenger." The Prophet said: "O ʿAbdullāh! She is a believing woman." ʿAbdullāh said: "By Him Who sent you with truth! I shall surely set her free and then marry her." He did so. Some Muslims ridiculed him and said, "Lo! He married a slave-girl." They thought it better to establish marriage-ties with polytheist men and women, because they were of "honorable" families. Then God revealed: *and certainly a believing bondswoman is better than an idolatress …* (*al-Durruʾl-manthūr*)

(3) Another tradition, quoted in the same book from Muqātil says that she was a bondswoman of Ḥudhayfah, whom he emancipated and married.

Author's comment: The above traditions are not contradictory. Maybe there were various such cases, and then the verse was revealed covering all of them.

There are some traditions showing that this verse abrogated verse 5:6, or was abrogated by it. We have shown the absurdity of these views, and we shall discuss those traditions when commenting on verse 5:6.

almizan.org

almizan.org

Verses 222-223

وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْمَحِيضِ ۖ قُلْ هُوَ أَذًى فَاعْتَزِلُوا النِّسَاءَ فِي الْمَحِيضِ ۖ وَلَا
تَقْرَبُوهُنَّ حَتَّىٰ يَطْهُرْنَ ۖ فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْنَ فَأْتُوهُنَّ مِنْ حَيْثُ أَمَرَكُمُ اللَّهُ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ
يُحِبُّ التَّوَّابِينَ وَيُحِبُّ الْمُتَطَهِّرِينَ ﴿٢٢٢﴾ نِسَاؤُكُمْ حَرْثٌ لَكُمْ فَأْتُوا حَرْثَكُمْ أَنَّىٰ
شِئْتُمْ ۖ وَقَدِّمُوا لِأَنْفُسِكُمْ ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّكُمْ مُلَاقُوهُ ۗ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ﴿٢٢٣﴾

(2:222-223) ***And they ask you about menstruation. Say it is a discomfort; therefore, keep aloof from the women during the menstruation and do not go near them until they have become clean; then when they have cleansed themselves, go in them as Allah has commanded you; surely Allah loves those who purify themselves. Your women are a tillage for you, so go unto your tillage when you like, and do good beforehand for yourselves; and fear Allah, and know that you are to meet Him, and give good news to the believers.***

Commentary

And they ask you about menstruation. Say: It is a discomfort: *Maḥīḍ* and *ḥayḍ* are verbal infinitives; the Arabs say: *ḥāḍati al-marʾaḥ* when the natural system of the woman discharges the well-known periodic blood, which has its own special color, etc. and is a peculiarity of women. Its active participle (*ism al-fāʿil*) is used in both masculine and feminine genders, because there is no risk of misunderstanding. They say *ḥāʾiḍ* and *ḥāiḍah* that is, the woman having monthly period; as they say *ḥāmil* and *ḥāmilah* that is, the pregnant women.

Adhā means discomfort and distress. Some people say that it is synonymous with *ḍarar* (harm, loss). But it is not correct. The opposite of *ḍarar* (harm, loss) is *nafʿ* (benefit, profit); but *nafʿ* is not the opposite of *adhā*. Also people say *dawāun muḍirrun* (harmful medicine); but if they said *dawāʾun muʾdhin* it would give another meaning; disagreeable or unpleasant medicine. Moreover, the Qur'an says: *They shall by no means*

harm you (lan yaḍurrūkum) *but with a distress* (adhā) (3:111) There would be no sense if you read it as: "they shall by no means harm you but with a harm." In some other verses, also, it is difficult to interpret *adhā* as *ḍarar* (loss, harm): *Surely [as for] those who annoy* (yuʾdhūna) *Allah and His Messenger …* (33:57); *O my people! Why do you give me trouble* (tuʾdhūnanī) *and you know indeed that I am Allah's Messenger to you* (61:5). Apparently, discomfort (*adhā*) signifies the effect of a disagreeable thing, and there may be times when a situation can be a discomfort as well as a harm or loss.

Menstruation is called *adhā* in the meaning described above—discomfort, distress, disagreeable.

Those who interpret *adhā* as harm, say that the question was about sexual intercourse during the monthly period, and God replied that it was harmful. The physicians have said that at that time nature is occupied with cleansing the womb and making it ready for pregnancy, and sexual intercourse in the midst of that would create a disturbance which is harmful to the health.

… therefore, keep aloof from the women during the menstruation and do not go near them: *Iʿtizāl* means to withdraw, to retire, to avoid mingling. They say *ʿazalta nalībahu* when you separate his share and keep it in a place away from the others' shares.

Qurb (to be near) is the opposite of *buʿd* (to be far away, distant). It is used with the preposition *min* (from) and also without any preposition, as in this verse.

Keep aloof from the women during the menstruation means "do not establish sexual relation with them during the passing of blood."

People have had different views and customs about women in their monthly period. The Jews were extremely harsh in this matter. They ostracized such a woman even in food and drink. Her pots were separated, she took her meal apart from others, sat away from all the household, and slept alone. The Torah had ordained very severe rules concerning that period: about the woman as, well as about those who were unfortunate enough to go near her or even to touch her.

The Christians had no restriction at all about mingling, or even sleeping with them. The pagans of Arabia had no fixed rule. The Arabs of Medina and its neighborhood had adopted some of the Jewish customs, and had thus made the lives of rich women difficult for them. On the other hand some pagans liked to have sexual intercourse with them in

the belief that if a woman became pregnant at that time, the child would be cruel and extremely fond of shedding blood—these were admirable qualities for a man among the bedouins!

Apparently the words of this verse confirm the Jewish custom, but it is not so. When we read the next sentence, then when they have cleansed themselves, go in to them as God has commanded you, we know that it means 'going in to them from their front.' It means that it was only this act, that is, sexual intercourse in to their front, which was prohibited by the preceding sentences, and that the words, "keep aloof from them" and "do not go near them" are not used in their literal meaning; rather they are metaphors for sexual relations. Accordingly, this verse prohibits only this one action, and imposes no restriction whatsoever on mingling with them in food, drink, sleep, and so on. In short, Islam adopted the middle course between the severe restrictions of the Jews and the free license of the Christians.

The word "menstruation" (*maḥīḍ*) appears in the question, and then again in the answer (keep aloof … during the menstruation) Why has the word been repeated instead of using a pronoun in the answer? It is because there is a difference in meaning of the two words: the first refers to the menstruation, and the second to its period.

… until they have become clean; then when they have cleansed themselves, go into them as Allah has commanded you: Cleanliness (*ṭahārah*) and its opposite, uncleanliness (*najāsah*) are among the most extensively applied concepts in Islam. They have their own comprehensive laws which cover a major part of religious commandments. The two words, because of their very common use, have become *al-ḥaqīqat al-sharʿiyyah* as though they were "originally made to express these religious concepts."

The meaning of cleanliness is known to the whole of mankind in spite of the differences in their languages. It shows that the idea of *ṭahārah* is well-known to all human beings whatever their origin and period.

Life depends on exploiting material things, and using them to achieve its goal. Man desires whatever he desires only because of its benefit, use and characteristics. The most basic and most comprehensive are the benefits concerned with feeding and reproduction.

Sometimes some changes occur in these material things which cause repulsion; and man wants to throw such things away. Such changes appear mostly in taste, smell or color. When this change appears, the material

becomes unsavory and repulsive. This change is called uncleanliness (*najāsah*). Its opposite is *ṭahārah* which implies that the thing is still in its original condition of benefit and use, which attracts the man to it.

Cleanliness and uncleanliness are, therefore, two mutually exclusive qualities of a thing: it has either a quality which makes it lie likeable or another which makes it repulsive.

Man in the beginning must have perceived these qualities within the sphere of the five senses; gradually the concept would have been widened to cover mental and spiritual subjects, depending on whether those ideas were attractive or repulsive. Thus we come to the concept of *ṭahārah* and *najāsah* in parentage, character, belief, action and word.

There are four words with nearly the same meaning: *naẓāfah*, *nazāhah*, *quds* and *subḥān*.

Naẓāfah: It is the cleanliness of a thing after it had become unclean. It is exclusively used for the things which may be perceived by one of the five senses.

Nazāhah: Its real meaning is "to be far away, distant." Its use for cleanliness is metaphorical—the thing is far from ugliness, uncleanliness.

Quds and *subḥān* are preserved for mental and spiritual subjects.

Near in meaning to *najāsah* are *qadhārah* (filthiness), *rijs* (dirtiness) and *rujz* (uncleanliness).

Qadhārah: Its real meaning is "to be distant." The verbs and adjectives derived from this verbal infinitive are used for a she-camel which remains aloof from the drove, for an unsocial man who does not mingle with others, for a person isolated from others and for a thing which is disliked. Therefore, its use in the meaning of *najāsah* must be metaphorical because an unclean thing is left and put aside until it is clean again.

Rijs and *rujz*: Their original meaning is fright and aversion. Their use in the meaning of uncleanliness is metaphorical.

Islam has extended the meaning of cleanliness and uncleanliness to cover not only the things perceived by the five senses but also to ideas and thoughts. According to Islam, even general principles and social laws are either clean or unclean. For example, God says in this verse: *do not go near them until they have become clean …* (Here cleanliness refers to cessation of menstruation,—a material cleanliness) Also, He says: *And your garments do purify* (74:4); *… but He intends to purify you …* (5:6); *These are they whom Allah does not intend to purify their hearts …*(5:41); *None*

shall touch it save the purified ones (56:79). Some of these verses refer to spiritual purifications and cleanliness.

The Islamic shariah treats some unclean things as *al-aʿyanuʾn-najisah* (inherently unclean things). Some of them are the blood, urine, stool and semen of man and of some animals, corpses, dogs and pigs. It has ordered the believers to protect themselves from these things in prayers, food and drink.

Ṭahārah is of two categories: From *khabath* by which one becomes clean after coming into touch with the above mentioned inherently unclean things; and from *ḥadath*, which comes through *wuḍū* or an obligatory bath as explained in the books of Islamic laws.

It was explained earlier that Islam is the religion of monotheism. This monotheism is the root to which all the branches owe their existence. Now the belief in monotheism is the highest cleanliness before God. After that come other fundamentals of faith, and they increase the spiritual purification of man. Then comes ethical righteousness, and the laws of shariah made for the good in this world and the hereafter. The verse quoted above may be explained by keeping this principle in view. Also, it explains the verse of purity, *Allah only desires to keep away the uncleanliness from you, O People of the House! and to purify you a [thorough] purifying* (33:33).

Now we return to the explanation of the words used in this verse under discussion: "until they have become clean," that is, until the blood stops. That is the beginning of the period of cleanliness (*ṭuhr*).

Then when they have cleansed themselves, that is, when they have taken an obligatory bath or at least washed the part of body from where blood comes out.

… go into them as Allah has commanded you: This command comes after the order forbidding sexual relation with them; therefore, it signifies only that the restriction is now lifted; in other words, it means that sexual relations with them are allowed after their becoming clean, not that it is obligatory. Go into them is a metaphor for that relation. It is an example of the character building of the Qur'an; as is the phrase, as God has commanded you. Sexual relations are generally regarded as an amusement. But the Qur'an draws man's attention to the fact that it is a thing ordered by God, the order being ingrained in his nature. We may call it a creative order—an order given not in words, but programmed into our creation and nature. Thus the Qur'an reminds us that it is an action without which

the human species cannot survive; such an important function should not be treated as a sport or an amusement; it is one of the fundamental laws of nature.

This verse is similar to the words of God: … *now be in contact with them and seek what Allah has written for you* … (2:187), and: … *go into your tillage when you like, and do good beforehand for yourselves* … (2:223).

Apparently, the order to go into them refers to that "creative order" which is known because God has given human beings reproductive organs and has created in them the power and inclination which lead them to reproduce.

Possibly the "command" could be interpreted as a legislative order: that it was obligatory to marry for a sufficient number of people to ensure continuity of the human race. But such a meaning is far-fetched.

Some commentators argue that the words as God has commanded you prohibit going into the posterior of the women. But it is the weakest argument; this subject is difficult to prove from this verse. The argument cannot be based on the order, go into them, because, as explained earlier, this order, coming after a prohibition, signifies only the permission to establish sexual contact, it is not an obligatory rule. Therefore, if one were to ignore it one would not be committing an offence. Nor can it be argued on the strength of the words, as God has commanded you, because, the command referred to herein is the creative, not the legislative one, as we have explained just now. And even if we accept, for the sake of argument, that it is a legislative order, it would be obligatory for only "a sufficient number of people," as we have explained above. And going against an obligatory order is unlawful only when that order is personally obligatory on oneself.

Surely Allah loves those who turn much [to Him] and He loves those who purify themselves: *Tawbah* (usually translated as repentance) means returning to God. *Taṭahhur* means purifying and cleansing oneself; in other words, turning away from dirtiness and returning to the original cleanliness. The meanings of both words come true when one obeys the command of God, and especially so in the matters of cleanliness and uncleanliness. By doing whatever God has told one to do, and abstaining from what He has forbidden, one purifies oneself from the uncleanliness of disobedience, and comes back to his Lord. That is why God has ended this verse on these words; they are, therefore, applied to all the

rules mentioned before them —Keep aloof from the women during the menstruation and go into them as God has commanded you.

The sentences, *Surely Allah loves those who turn much [to Him] and He loves those who purify themselves*, are not limited with any qualification or condition. Therefore, they apply to all the grades of cleanliness, as mentioned earlier. And the forms *mutaṭahhirīn* and *tawwābīn* signify great emphasis. These two factors taken together signify that God loves all kinds of repentance (be it by asking for His forgiveness, obeying all His commands or having true faith and belief) and all kinds of purification (be it by washing oneself, doing ablution, taking the obligatory bath, performing good deeds or acquiring true spiritual knowledge). Also, it signifies an increase by number: God loves repeated repentance and repeated cleanliness.

Your women are a tillage for you, so go unto your tillage when you like: *Ḥarth* is an infinitive verb, meaning "to till, to cultivate." It is also used for the land which is tilled or cultivated.

Annā is an adverb meaning "when," "whenever." In this sentence it is synonymous with *matā* (when). Sometimes it is also used for "where." God says: … *O Maryam! Whence* (annā) *comes this to you? She said: It is from Allah (*3:36).

If, in the verse under discussion, *annā* means "where," then its meaning would be, "where you like." If it means, "when," then it means, "when you like." In any case, it gives a sort of freedom to the couple, and that is why we cannot take the words, "so go unto your tillage," to be an obligatory order. No one gives a compulsory order and then leaves it in the hands of the doer to do as he likes.

The verse begins with the sentence, *Your women are a tillage for you*; after this reasoning comes the order, and there also the word "tillage" is repeated. This emphasis shows that the freedom given to man of going in to the women is either about the place of the intercourse or about its time; but it is not a freedom of entering anywhere in her body. She is a tillage and that idea must be kept in mind when approaching her.

If the order means, 'so go into your tillage at any place you like,' then it is not concerned with the time of intercourse, and has no conflict whatsoever with the previous verse, keep aloof from the women during the menstruation and do not go near them. If, on the other hand, it means, 'so go into your tillage at any time you like,' then it shall be limited to the

period of purity from menstruation, because of the previous verse.

Just to avoid any misunderstanding, it is necessary to point out that this verse could not have abrogated the verse of menstruation—no matter whichever of the two was revealed first: The verse of menstruation gives two reasons why sexual relation in that period is forbidden—and both reasons are still valid, in spite of the verse of tillage. First, it says that menstruation is a discomfort and it continues to be a discomfort. Second, it shows that this order was given to avoid dirtiness and to remain clean, and God always loves those who remain clean and pure; so much so that He counts keeping them cleansed as one of His graces upon them; *Allah does not desire to put on you any difficulty, but He intends to purify you and that He may complete His favor on you …* (5:6) Such a language cannot be abrogated by a verse like that of tillage. Why? Because this verse says that your women are your tillage, so come into your tillage when you like. Now, the reason for this putative "concession" was present even when the prohibition was ordained. If it could not stop its promulgation, how can it cause its abrogation after it had already been firmly established? Second, the verse of tillage ends on the words, "and do good beforehand for yourselves, and fear God, and know that you will meet Him." Such an ending would be out of place if the verse (of tillage) contained a concession.

The meaning of the verse is as follows: Women are to humanity as tillage is to an individual. Agricultural land is needed to preserve the seed and to produce food, so that the human race may continue to exist. Likewise, women are needed for the continuity of humanity. According to the system created by God, the woman's womb is the place where a child is made and develops from a microscopic sperm to a human being. As the original place of that sperm is the body of man, He created between the man and the woman a love and compassion and an attraction which excites the man to seek the woman.

As the creative purpose of this mutual attraction is to pave the way for the continuity of the human race, there was no reason why it should be confined to one place and not another, or one time and not another, as long as it helped in achieving that goal and did not hinder any other obligatory work.

This explanation shows the relevance of the words do good beforehand for yourselves, coming after the verse of tillage.

Someone has written that the verse of tillage gives permission to

remove the male organ from the woman just before ejaculation. Such an interpretation is patently absurd. No less absurd is the view that the words, do good beforehand mean saying … *bismi'llāh* … (by the name of God) before the intercourse.

… ***and do good beforehand for yourselves; and fear Allah, and know that you are to meet Him, and give good news to the believers:*** Obviously, these words addressed to males, or both males and females, are a sort of encouragement to keep the human species alive through marriage and reproduction. But is not an end in itself. Mankind and its continuity is desired only for the continuity of the religion of God, the dominance of monotheism and the divine worship through piety. God says: *And I did not create the jinn and the human beings except that they should worship Me* (51:56). When He commands them to do anything concerning their life in this world, it is done only to make it easier for them to worship their Lord; it is not done with the aim of encouraging them to submerge themselves in sexual desire and worldly attractions.

No doubt the apparent meaning of *do good beforehand for yourselves* is "reproduce and bring into this world new souls to replace those who are dying every day"; but it is not the final goal: the real aim is to keep the remembrance of God going on, by producing righteous people who will do good deeds, the recompense and reward of which will reach their forefathers who were instrumental in bringing those good-doers into the world. God says: … *and We write down what they have sent before and their footprints* … (36:12).

This leads us to believe that the real meaning of, *do good beforehand for yourselves* is 'send good deeds beforehand for the day of resurrection.' God says: … *the day when man shall see what his two hands have sent before* … (78:40); … *and whatever of good you send on beforehand for yourselves you will find it with Allah* … (73:20).

This verse under discussion (*and do good beforehand for yourselves, and fear Allah, and know that you are to meet Him* …) is similar to verse 59:18: *O you who believe! Fear Allah, and let every soul consider what it has sent on for tomorrow and fear Allah; surely Allah is Aware of what you do.*

In short, the meaning of these sentences is as follows:

… and do good beforehand for yourselves: Send on good deeds beforehand for the day of resurrection. Producing children and training them to be righteous servants of God and good members of the society is one

of those good deeds.

and fear Allah: *taqwā* (fear of God, piety) consists of going into the tillage as commanded by God, neither exceeding the limits imposed by Him, neglecting the divine ordinance, nor committing unlawful acts.

and know that you are to meet Him: The order, in fact, means 'fear God whom you have to meet on the day of resurrection, lest your reckoning be severe.' The same is the significance of verse 59:18, mentioned earlier which says: *and fear Allah; surely Allah is Aware of what you do*. It is not uncommon to use the verb "to know" for the meaning "to be on guard," "to safeguard" and "to look out." God says: … *and know that Allah intervenes between man and his heart* … (8:24); it means, 'be afraid of His intervention between you and your hearts.'

and give good news to the believers: Good deeds and fear of the day of reckoning are the chief characteristics of faith. Therefore, the talk was ended by giving good news to the believers.

For this very reason, verse 59:18 began with the words: *O you who believe.*

Examining Narrations

(1) Aḥmad, ʿAbd b. Ḥamīd, ad-Dārimī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasāʾī, Ibn Mājah, Abū Yaʿlā, Ibn al-Mundhir, Abū Ḥātim, al-Nahḥās (in al-Nāsikh), Abū Ḥayyān, and al-Bayhaqī (in his *al-Sunan*) have narrated from Anas: "The Jews, when a woman of their house was in monthly period, turned her out of the house; they did not eat with her, did not drink with her, nor did they live with her in the same house. The Messenger of God was asked concerning this matter. Then God sent down the verse: *And they ask you about menstruation. Say: It is a discomfort; therefore, keep aloof from the women during the menstruation* … The Messenger of God, therefore, said: 'Remain with them in the (same) houses, and do everything except sexual intercourse.' This report reached the Jews, and they said, 'This man does not want to leave anything to our customs without going against it.' Usayd b. al-Ḥuḍayr and ʿAbbād b. Bishr came and said: 'O Messenger of God! The Jews are saying so-and-so. Should we not now establish sexual relations also with them?" On hearing it the face of the Messenger of God changed and we thought that he had become

angry with them. Then they went out; and at the same moment some milk was brought to the Messenger of God as a present; so he sent it behind them and made them drink it. Thus they knew that he was not angry with them." (*al-Durr al-manthūr*)

(2) It is reported from al-Suddī about the verse, And they ask you about menstruation that the man who asked it was Thābit b. al-Daḥdāḥ. (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: The same thing has been narrated also from Muqatil.

(3) There is a tradition that Imam al-Ṣādiq said about the word of God, go into them as God has commanded you: It is about seeking a child; therefore seek a child from where God has commanded you. (al-Tahdhīb)

(4) Imam al-Ṣādiq was asked: "What can the husband of a menstruating woman get from her?" He said: "Everything except the front part itself." (*al-Kāfī*)

(5) Another tradition is reported from the same Imam about the woman whose blood stops at the end of her usual period. The Imam said: "If her husband is overcome by sexual desire, then he should order her to wash her front part, then he may touch her, if he so wishes, before she takes her obligatory bath." Other tradition adds: "And the bath is preferable to me." (*ibid.*)

Author's comment: There are numerous traditions of the same meaning. The word used in the Qur'an is recited *ḥattā yaṭhurna* (till they have become clean); and it refers to the stopping of blood. Therefore, the Qur'an and these traditions support each other.

It is said that the difference between the two words, *yaṭhurna* (they have become clean) and *yataṭahharna* (they have cleansed themselves) is that the second form implies doing something by one's own choice; therefore, it would mean taking the bath; but the first does not imply any choice; thus it would refer to the stopping of blood.

Accordingly, sexual intercourse is prohibited until they have become clean, that is, until the blood stops. As soon as the blood stops, relations are again allowed. *When they have cleansed themselves go into them:* If the cleansing refers to washing it would mean that the washing, as described in this tradition, is sunnah (commendable); and if it means taking the obligatory bath, then the verse would imply that it is commendable (sunnah)

to go into them after they have taken their obligatory bath, as the above tradition says, "and bath is preferable to me." But in no case does this verse imply that going into them after stoppage of blood and before the bath is prohibited, because the moment of prohibition lasts until the blood stops.

(6) There is a tradition about the words of God, Surely God loves those who turn much (to Him), and He loves those who purify themselves, that Imam al-Ṣādiq said: "The people used to cleanse themselves (after defecation) with cotton and stones and so on. Then was instituted cleansing with water, and it is a good habit. Therefore, the Messenger of God ordered it and did it. Then God sent down in His Book: *Surely Allah loves those who turn much [to Him], and He loves those who purify themselves.*" (*al-Kāfī*)

Author's comment: There are numerous traditions with this meaning, and it is said in some of them that the first man to cleanse himself with water was Barāʾ b. ʿĀzib; then this verse was revealed and the custom established.

(7) There is a tradition in the same book from Salām b. al-Mustanīr that he said: "I was with Abū Jaʿfar when Ḥimrān b. Aʿyun entered and asked him concerning some things. When Ḥimrān wanted to stand up (and go back), he told Abū Jaʿfar: 'I wish to inform you—May God prolong your life and may He grant us the benefit of your presence—that we come to you; and before we go out from your presence, our hearts become soft, our souls think no more about this world, and we disdain the wealth which people have in their hands. Then we go away from your presence, and when we mingle with people and traders, we (again) love this world.' Abū Jaʿfar said: 'It is these hearts; at one time they become hard, at another, soft.' Then the Imam continued: 'Surely, the companions of Muḥammad once told him: "O Messenger of God! We are afraid of hypocrisy (appearing) in ourselves." He asked: "And why do you feel so?" They said: "When we are in your presence and you remind us (of God) and invite us (to piety), we become afraid (of the displeasure of God), and we forget the world and forsake it, so much so that we (seem to) see the hereafter and the garden and the fire; this all is so long as we are in your presence. But as soon as we come out of your presence, and enter these (our) houses, and feel the scent of our children and see our

families, our condition changes almost completely, as though we had no conviction of anything. Do you fear that it is hypocrisy on our part?" Then the Messenger of God told them: "Not at all. Surely, these steps are of Satan who wants to attract you towards this world. By God! If you continued in that condition which you have just described, you would indeed shake hands with the angels, and would walk upon the water. And had it not been that you commit sins and then seek pardon from God, He would certainly create (another) creation who would commit sins and then ask forgiveness of God, so that God would forgive them. Verily the believer is seduced, (but is also) often-returning (to God)." Have you not heard the words of God: *Surely Allah loves those who turn much [to Him], and He loves those who purify themselves*. And God says: *And that ask forgiveness of your Lord, then turn to Him …* (11:3)' "

Author's comment: A similar tradition has been reported by al-ʿAyyāshī in his *al-Tafsīr*.

The words of the Prophet, "if you continued in that condition…" point to the position of *wilāyah* (friendship of God) which means keeping aloof from the world and fixing the eyes on to what is with God. We have explained it partly under verse 2:156.

His words, "And had it not been that you commit sins …," allude to a mystery of the divine decree. And we shall talk about it under verse 15:21 (*And there is not a thing but with Us are the treasures of it, and We do not send it down but in a known measure*) and other such verses.

The words, "Have you not heard….," are of Abū Jaʿfar and are addressed to Ḥimrān. These words interpret *tawbah* and *ṭahārah* as returning to God by desisting from wrong and removing the filth of sins from the soul and the rust of mistakes from the heart. It is an example of deducing a conclusion by looking at a verse from one level while at another level a new result (but never in conflict with the first) may be obtained. For example, the verse, *None shall touch it save the purified ones* (56:79) proves at one level that none has the knowledge of the Book except the sinless members of the family of the Prophet, while, on other level, it declares that touching the writing of the Qur'an without doing *wuḍu* or taking the bath is prohibited.

Creation progresses, taking from the treasures that are with God, until